A U M

Let us take refuge with Mezdam from evil thoughts which mislead and afflict us; the origin of His being none can know. Except Himself, who can comprehend it? Existence and unity and identity are inseparable properties of His original substance, and are not adventitious to Him.—*Prophet Abad in The Desatir.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. IV **SEPTEMBER, 1916** **No. 11**

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

THE BHAGAVAD-GITA

CHAPTER XIII.

DEVOTION BY MEANS OF THE DISCRIMINATION OF THE KSHETRA (BODY) FROM KSHETRAJNA (SOUL).

BY A STUDENT OF W. Q. J.

IN the Path magazine of October, 1890, Wm. Q. Judge published this Thirteenth Chapter entire, prefacing the publication with the following words:

"There are nowadays many professors of occultism, just as years ago there was a numerous brood of those who pretended to know about the philosopher's stone. Both, however, were and are learned chiefly in repeating what they have heard of as occultism, with no substance or reality underneath all the profession. Now, as then, the mere incidentals of the true occultist's practice are thought of, spoken about, and pursued. Phenomena or the power to produce them constitute the end and aim of these searchers' efforts. But seek as we may, we will not find among them real knowledge, real experience, true initiation. Being on the wrong path, deluded by false light, they cannot do aught but mystify, annoy, and deceive those who put their trust in them. During the days of Rosicrucian fame there was some excuse for the mass of seekers, but since the old Hindu works have become gradually known to everyone, that exculpation is at an end; for on every hand the note of warning is sounded, and everywhere are signs that show in what direction lies the true path. Particularly is this so in that wonderful book, the *Bhagavad-Gita.* In it however void of phenomena, however inattractive in respect to bait for psychic emotion, it points out the way, declares the mystic science, true devotion, right action."

It has been said of this chapter that it contains the whole of occultism, by which is meant, that all-inclusive occultism which begins with the highest point of perception and realization—the Self within, and which regards action and reaction on every plane of manifestation, as the process by which individual and universal power and wisdom are attained.

That which stands in the way of knowledge is ignorance, and from the point of view of true occultism, the root of all ignorance lies in misconceptions as to one's own essential nature.

In this chapter Krishna treats of devotion by means of the discrimination of the body from the soul, meaning thought and action based upon a knowledge of what is body and what is soul. He then speaks of "this perishable body" as including not only the physical form, but such elements as the following: *Ahankara*-egotism, *Buddhi*-intellect or judgment, the unmanifest, invisible spirit; the ten centers of action, the mind and the five objects of sense; desire, aversion, pleasure and pain, persistency of life, and firmness, the power of cohesion. In this statement are included all that the ordinary mind conceives of as conscious existence, and purposely so, for if we are to arrive at an understanding of what is permanent, we must first see clearly what is impermanent and perishable.

In the divisions given by Krishna, *Ahankara* is placed first because in it is to be found the main cause of differences. *Ahankara* is the tendency to identify ourselves with forms and conditions; from that self-identifying attachment all the variations proceed; intellect or judgment is based upon that self-identification, as are all the likes and dislikes, modes, and channels of action.

If we can grasp the idea of the perishable nature of *Ahankara*-egotism, the perishable nature of the other elements can be understood. It is a fact that we do identify ourselves with the ever-changing perishable body, and with its conditions and relations, which are also ever-changing. We say, "I am happy, or I am sad", "I am sick or I am well", "I am contented or I am dissatisfied", all of these expressions being due to some form or condition which is changeable. We should observe that the self-identifying attachment is chiefly concerned with the *present* form and conditions, although we are aware that other forms and conditions have existed in the past, to which we were attached by like or dislike, and that still others will exist in the future.

Through all the changes of the past we have gone; through all the changes of the future we must go. The past changes have perished; the present changes are perishing; the future changes will also perish; but "we" remain through them all, unchanged and unchanging. If we can grasp this idea and hold to it, we will have taken the first step towards right knowledge and freedom, for, as an ancient sage has put it, "The Soul is the perceiver; is assuredly vision itself pure and simple; unmodified; and looks directly on

ideas". In this chapter are the following statements of a similar kind: "I am the knower in every mortal body"; "As a single sun illuminateth the whole world, even so doth the One Spirit illumine every body"; "He who seeth the Supreme Being existing alike imperishable in all perishable things, sees indeed"; "Perceiving the same lord present in everything and everywhere, he does not by the lower self *(Ahankara)* destroy his own soul, but goeth to the supreme end".

It must be apparent to every one who thinks, that to be immortal necessitates being changeless, for that which changes has no stability. There could not be a continuity of consciousness even through one physical existence, unless there is permanence of identity; the same "I" has noted the conditions, ideas, and feelings from childhood up to the present time, and will note them through all the years to come.

This Western mind of ours finds a difficulty in reconciling "changelessness" with "progression"; this is because of *Ahankara,* the tendency to identify ourselves with forms and conditions. Forms and conditions do change, but not of themselves; there is That which causes change to succeed change, and That is the indwelling spirit, which continually impels the instruments It has evolved towards further perfection. So progress and evolution mean an unfolding from within outward, a constant impulsion towards a better and better instrument for the use of the Spirit—the Self within.

"The spirit in the body is called *Maheswara,* the Great Lord, the spectator, the admonisher, the sustainer, the enjoyer, and also *Paramatma,* the highest soul". This sentence really tells the whole story; the Spirit sees, rectifies, sustains and enjoys *through Its instrument* or vehicle; the ideal of progress is a perfected vehicle which will contact and reflect in the highest sense all worlds and all beings.

The term "body" has been used throughout this chapter, but it must not be supposed that only the physical body is meant. The physical body is included in the term, because itself is the product of involution and evolution from higher states of substance or matter. Krishna says "Know that *Prakriti* or nature, (substance), and *Purusha* the spirit, are without beginning. And know that the passions and the three qualities are sprung from Nature. Nature or *prakriti* is said to be that which operates in producing cause and effect in actions". There can be no action unless there is something to be acted upon; that something is the highest substance; it is that which fills all space, and from which all denser forms of substance or matter have been evolved, and within which they are contained. Thus, the body represents on this plane all the other states

of substance from which it has been evolved; it is surrounded by, and connected with them. A study of the Seven Principles of Man will give an understanding of this statement, if it is remembered that Man, the Thinker, is not any of his principles; they are his vehicles or instruments.

"Individual spirit, or *Purusha* is said to be the cause of experiencing pain and pleasure" (through the connection with nature found in the instrument); "for spirit, when invested with matter or *prakriti* experienceth the qualities that proceed from *prakriti;* its connection with these qualities" (and self-identification with them) "is the cause of its rebirth in good and evil wombs".

Krishna says that "the passions and the three qualities are sprung from nature" *(prakriti)*. The three qualities represent attachment to bodily existence through love of that which is good and pleasant *(sattva);* through a propensity for passion and desire *(rajas);* and through heedlessness, which destroys the power of judgment. They are all due to self-identification with one form or another of bodily existence.

That which informs and moves all manifestation is the One Spirit. That Spirit is the Real and Permanent in all forms and beings; as Krishna says "it is wisdom itself, the object of wisdom, and that which is to be gained by wisdom"; it is "the receptacle and the seed"; it is the power to perceive, the consciousness, the life in all things. It is the cause of all manifestation and the holder of all knowledge gained thereby. Causing and perceiving change, It changes not. All power and all law proceed from It, are inherent in It. This is the meaning of "Spirit", where Krishna says in conclusion: "Those who with the eye of wisdom thus perceive what is the difference between the body and Spirit, and the destruction of the illusion of objects, go to the Supreme". By the "illusion of objects" is meant, the seeing of objects as different from Spirit. Each object may be called an expression of Spirit through various evolved vehicles, whether these be called atoms, molecules, or forms composed of them.

In the "Voice of the Silence", a statement of the same import may be remembered: "The eye of Spirit—the eye which never closes, the eye for which there is no veil in all her (Nature's) kingdoms".

All creatures, being essentially Spirit, strive (consciously or unconsciously) to realize their spiritual being through contact psychical and physical with all manifested nature; some by meditation; some by service; some—mistakenly—by selfishness through separateness. While all paths lead to the Supreme, it is only when the Permanent as distinguished from the Perishable is realized, that erroneous paths are forsaken and the true Path followed.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE

OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

DISCUSSIONS OF THE STANZAS OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE "SECRET DOCTRINE."

(Continued from August)

The "Transactions" were compiled from shorthand notes taken at the meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge of the Theosophical Society, January 10th to June 20th, 1889, and later printed in pamphlet form. Copies of this pamphlet are getting rarer with every year. THEOSOPHY is therefore reprinting the "Transactions" for the benefit of present-day students. Part I consists of discussions of Stanzas I and II of the *"Book of Dzyan,"* upon which *"The Secret Doctrine"* is based. The answers to the questions were given by H. P. Blavatsky. Students not possessing *"The Secret Doctrine"* will find that these Stanzas are also printed in H. P. Blavatsky's *"Voice of the Silence,"* which is owned by most students, or can be purchased, through THEOSOPHY, at the nominal price of seventy-five cents; postpaid. The first installment of the "Transactions" was printed in the June issue of THEOSOPHY.

IV.

STANZA I. *(continued).*

Q. With reference to sloka (6), where it speaks of the "Seven Lords," since confusion is apt to arise as to the correct application of the terms, what is the distinction between Dhyan-Chohans, Planetary Spirits, Builders and Dhyani-Buddhas?

A. As an additional two volumes of the *Secret Doctrine* would be required to explain all the Hierarchies; therefore, much relating to them has been omitted from the Stanzas and Commentaries. A short definition may, however, be tried. Dhyan-Chohan is a generic term for all Devas, or celestial beings. A Planetary Spirit is a Ruler of a planet, a kind of finite or personal god. There is a marked difference, however, between the Rulers of the Sacred Planets and the Rulers of a small "chain" of worlds like our own. It is no serious objection to say that the earth has, nevertheless, six invisible companions and four different planes, as every other planet, for the difference between them is vital in many a point. Say what one may, our Earth was never numbered among the seven *sacred* planets of the ancients, though in exoteric, popular astrology it stood as a substitute for a secret planet now lost to astronomy, yet well known to initiated specialists. Nor were the Sun or the Moon in that number, though accepted in our day by modern astrology; for the Sun is a Central *Star,* and the Moon a dead planet.

Q. Were none of the six globes of the "terrene" chain numbered among the sacred planets?

A. None. The latter were all planets on *our* plane, and some of them have been discovered later.

Secret Doctrine references are to the Original Edition.—[ED. THEOSOPHY].

Q. Can you tell us something of the planets for which the Sun and the Moon were substitutes?

A. There is no secret in it, though our modern astrologers are ignorant of these planets. One is an intra-mercurial planet, which is supposed to have been discovered, and named by anticipation Vulcan, and the other a planet with a retrograde motion, sometimes visible at a certain hour of night and apparently near the moon. The occult influence of this planet is transmitted by the moon.

Q. What is it that made these planets sacred or secret?

A. Their occult influences, as far as I know.

Q. Then do the Planetary Spirits of the Seven Sacred Planets belong to another hierarchy than to that of the earth?

A. Evidently; since the terrestrial spirit of the earth is not of a very high grade. It must be remembered that the planetary spirit has nothing to do with the spiritual man, but with things of matter and cosmic beings. The gods and rulers of our Earth are cosmic Rulers; that is to say, they form into shape and fashion cosmic matter, for which they were called *Cosmocratores*. They never had any concern with spirit; the Dhyani-Buddhas, belonging to quite a different hierarchy, are especially concerned with the latter.

Q. These seven Planetary Spirits have therefore nothing really to do with the earth except incidentally?

A. On the contrary, the "Planetary"—who are not the Dhyani Buddhas—have everything to do with the earth, physically and morally. It is they who rule its destinies and the fate of men. They are Karmic agencies.

Q. Have they anything to do with the fifth principle—the higher Manas?

A. No: they have no concern with the three higher principles; they have, however, something to do with the fourth. To recapitulate, therefore; the term "Dhyan-Chohan" is a generic name for all celestial beings. The "Dhyani-Buddhas" are concerned with the human higher triad in a mysterious way that need not be explained here. The "Builders" are a class called, as I already explained, *Cosmocratores,* or the invisible but intelligent Masons, who fashion matter according to the ideal plan ready for them in that which we call Divine and Cosmic Ideation. They were called by the early Masons the "Grand Architect of the Universe" *collectively:* but now the modern Masons make of their G. A. O. T. U. a personal and singular Deity.

Q. Are they not also Planetary Spirits?

A. In a sense they are—as the Earth is also a Planet—but of a lower order.

Q. Do they act under the guidance of the Terrestrial Planetary Spirit?

A. I have just said that they were collectively that Spirit themselves. I wish you to understand that they are not an Entity,

a kind of a personal God, but Forces of nature acting under one immutable Law, on the nature of which it is certainly useless for us to speculate.

Q. But are there not Builders of Universes, and Builders of Systems, as there are Builders of our earth?

A. Assuredly there are.

Q. Then the terrestrial Builders are a Planetary "Spirit" like the rest of them, only inferior in kind?

A. I would certainly say so.

Q. Are they inferior according to the size of the planet or inferior in quality?

A. The latter, as we are taught. You see the ancients lacked our modern, and especially theological, conceit, which makes of this little speck of mud of ours something ineffably grander than any of the stars and planets known to us. If, for instance, Esoteric Philosophy teaches that the "Spirit" (collectively again) of Jupiter is far superior to the Terrestrial Spirit, it is not because Jupiter is so many times larger than our earth, but because its substance and texture are so much finer than, and superior to, that of the earth. And it is in proportion to this quality that the Hierarchies of respective "Planetary Builders" reflect and act upon the ideations they find planned for them in the Universal Consciousness, the real great Architect of the Universe.

Q. The Soul of the World, or "Anima Mundi"?

A. Call it so, if you like. It is the Antitype of these Hierarchies, which are its differentiated types. The one *impersonal* Great Architect of the Universe is MAHAT, the Universal Mind. And Mahat is a symbol, an abstraction, an aspect which assumed a hazy entitative form in the all-materializing conceptions of men.

Q. What is the real difference between the Dhyani-Buddhas in the orthodox and the esoteric conceptions?

A. A very great one philosophically. They are—as higher Devas—called by the Buddhists, Bôdhisatvas. Exoterically they are five in number, whereas in the esoteric schools they are seven, and not single Entities but *Hierarchies*. It is stated in the *Secret Doctrine* that five Buddhas have come and that two are to come in the sixth and seventh races. Exoterically their president is Vajrasattva, the "Supreme Intelligence" or "Supreme Buddha," but more transcendant still is Vajradhara, even as Parabrahm transcends Brahmâ or Mahat. Thus the exoteric and occult significations of the Dhyani-Buddhas are entirely different. Exoterically each is a trinity, three in one, all three manifesting simultaneously in three worlds—as a human Buddha on earth, a Dhyani-Buddha in the world of astral forms, and an arupa, or formless, Buddha in the highest Nirvanic realm. Thus for a human Buddha, an incarnation of one of these Dhyanis, the stay on earth is limited from seven to seven thousand years in various bodies, since as men they are subjected to normal conditions, accidents and death. In Esoteric philosophy, on the other hand, this means that only five out of the

"Seven Dhyani-Buddhas"—or, rather, the Seven Hierarchies of these Dhyanis, who, in Buddhist mysticism, are identical with the higher incarnating Intelligences, or the Kumâras of the Hindus—five only have hitherto appeared on earth in regular succession of incarnations, the last two having to come during the sixth and seventh Root-Races. This is, again, semi-allegorical, if not entirely so. For the sixth and seventh Hierarchies have been already incarnated on this earth together with the rest. But as they have reached "Buddhaship," so called, almost from the beginning of the fourth Root-Race, they are said to rest since then in conscious bliss and freedom till the beginning of the Seventh Round, when they will lead Humanity as a new race of Buddhas. These Dhyanis are connected only with Humanity, and, strictly speaking, only with the highest "principles" of men.

Q. Do the Dhyani-Buddhas and the Planetary Spirits in charge of the globes go into pralaya when their planets enter that state?

A. Only at the end of the seventh Round, and not between each round, for they have to watch over the working of the laws during these minor pralayas. Fuller details on this subject have already been written in the third volume of the *Secret Doctrine*. But all these differences in fact are merely functional, for they are all aspects of one and the same Essence.

Q. Does the hierarchy of Dhyanis, whose province it is to watch over a Round, watch during its period of activity, over the whole series of globes, or only over a particular globe?

A. There are incarnating and there are watching Dhyanis. Of the functions of the former you have just been told; the latter appear to do their work in this wise. Every class or hierarchy corresponds to one of the Rounds, the first and lowest hierarchy to the first and less developed Round, the second to the second, and so on till the seventh Round is reached, which is under the supervision of the highest Hierarchy of the Seven Dhyanis. At the last, they will appear on earth, as also will some of the Planetary, for the whole humanity will have become Bodhisattvas, their own "sons," *i. e.*, the "Sons" of their own Spirit and Essence or—themselves. Thus there is only a functional difference between the Dhyanis and the Planetary. The one are entirely divine, the other *sidereal*. The former only are called *Anupadaka*, parentless, because they radiated directly from that which is neither Father nor Mother but the unmanifested Logos. They are, in fact, the spiritual aspect of the seven Logoi; and the Planetary Spirits are in their totality, as the seven Sephiroth (the three higher being supercosmic abstractions and *blinds* in the Kabala), and constitute the Heavenly man, or Adam Kadmon; *Dhyani* is a generic name in Buddhism, an abbreviation for all the gods. Yet it must be ever remembered that though they are "gods," still they are not to be worshipped.

Q. Why not, if they are gods?

A. Because Eastern philosophy rejects the idea of a personal and extra-cosmic deity. And to those who call this *atheism,* I would say the following. It is illogical to worship one such god, for, as said in the Bible, "There be Lords many and Gods many." Therefore, *if* worship is desirable, we have to choose either the worship of many gods, each being no better or less limited than the other, viz., polytheism and idolatry, or choose, as the Israelites have done, one tribal or racial god from among them, and while believing in the existence of many gods, ignore and show contempt for the others, regarding our own as the highest and the "God of Gods." But this is logically unwarrantable, for such a god can be neither infinite nor absolute, but must be finite, that is to say, limited and conditioned by space and time. With the Pralaya the tribal god disappears, and Brahmâ and all the other Devas, and the gods are merged into the Absolute. Therefore, occultists do not worship or offer prayers to them, because if we did, we should have either to worship many gods, or pray to the Absolute, which, having no attributes, can have no ears to hear us. The worshipper even of many gods must of necessity be unjust to all the other gods; however far he extends his worship it is simply impossible for him to worship each severally; and in his ignorance, if he choose out any one in particular, he may by no means select the most perfect. Therefore, he would do better far to remember that every man has a god within, a direct ray from the Absolute, the celestial ray from the One; that he has his "god" *within,* not outside, of himself.

Q. Is there any name that can be applied to the planetary Hierarchy or spirit, which watches over the entire evolution of our own globe, such as Brahmâ for instance?

A. None, except the generic name, since it is a septenary and a Hierarchy; unless, indeed, we call it as some Kabalists do—"the Spirit of the Earth."

Q. It is very difficult to remember all these infinite Hierarchies of gods.

A. Not more so than to a chemist to remember the endless symbols of chemistry, if he is a Specialist. In India, alone, however, there are over 300 millions of gods and goddesses. The manus and Rishis are also planetary gods, for they are said to have appeared at the beginning of the human races to watch over their evolution, and to have incarnated and descended on earth subsequently in order to teach mankind. Then, there are the *Sapta Rishis,* the "Seven Rishis," said exoterically to reside in the constellation of the Great Bear. There are also planetary gods.

Q. Are they higher than Brahmâ?

A. It depends in what aspect one views Brahmâ. In esoteric philosophy he is the synthesis of the seven *logoi.* In exoteric theology he is an aspect of Vishnu with the Vaishnevas, with others something else, as in the *Trimurti,* the Hindu Trinity, he is the chief creator, whereas Vishnu is the Preserver, and Siva the De-

stroyer. In the Kabala he is certainly Adam Kadmon—the "male-female" man of the first chapter of *Genesis*. For the Manus proceed from Brahmâ as the Sephiroth proceed from Adam Kadmon, and they are also *seven* and *ten*, as circumstances require.

But we may just as well pass on to another Sloka of the Stanzas you want explained.

Sloka (9).—BUT WHERE WAS DANGMA WHEN THE ALAYA OF THE UNIVERSE *(Soul as the basis of all, Anima Mundi)* WAS IN PARAMARTHA *(Absolute Being and Consciousness which are Absolute Non-Being and Unconsciousness)* AND THE GREAT WHEEL WAS ANUPADAKA

Q. Does "Alaya" mean that which is never manifested and dissolved, and is it derived from "a," the negative particle, and "laya"?

A. If it is so etymologically—and I am certainly not prepared to answer you one way or the other—it would mean the reverse, since *laya* itself is just that which is not manifested; therefore it would signify *that which is not unmanifested* if anything. Whatever may be the etymological vivisection of the word, it is simply the "Soul of the World," *Anima Mundi*. This is shown by the very wording of the Sloka, which speaks of Alaya being in *Paramartha—i. e.*, in Absolute Non-Being and Unconsciousness, being at the same time absolute perfection or Absoluteness itself. This word, however, is the bone of contention between Yogachârya and the Madhyamika schools of Northern Buddhism. The scholasticism of the latter makes of *Paramartha (Satya)* something dependent on, and, therefore, relative to other things, thereby vitiating the whole metaphysical philosophy of the word Absoluteness. The other school very rightly denies this interpretation.

Q. Does not the Esoteric Philosophy teach the same doctrines as the Yogachârya School?

A. Not quite. But let us go on.

STANZA II.

Sloka (1). . . . WHERE WERE THE BUILDERS, THE LUMINOUS SONS OF MANVANTARIC DAWN? . . . IN THE UNKNOWN DARKNESS, IN THEIR AH-HI *(Chohanic, Dyani-Buddhic)* PARANISHPANNA, THE PRODUCERS OF FORM *(rupa)* FROM NO-FORM *(arupa)*, THE ROOT OF THE WORLD—THE DEVAMATRI AND SVABHAVAT, RESTED IN THE BLISS OF NON-BEING.

Q. Are the "luminous sons of manvantaric dawn" perfected human spirits of the last Manvantara, or are they on their way to humanity in this or a subsequent Manvantara?

A. In this case, which is that of a *Maha*-manvantara after a *Maha*-pralaya, they are the latter. They are the primordial seven rays from which will emanate in their turn all the other luminous

and non-luminous lives, whether Archangels, Devils, men or apes. Some have been and some will only now become human beings. It is only after the differentiation of the seven rays and after the seven forces of nature have taken them in hand and worked upon them, that they become cornerstones, or rejected pieces of clay. Everything, therefore, is in these seven rays, but it is impossible to say at this stage in which, because they are not yet differentiated and individualized.

Q. In the following passage:—

"The 'Builders,' the 'Sons of Manvantaric Dawn,' are the real creators of the Universe; and in this doctrine, which deals only with our Planetary System, they, as the architects of the latter, are also called the 'Watchers' of the Seven Spheres, which exoterically are the seven planets, and esoterically the seven earths or spheres (planets) or our chain also."

By planetary system is the solar system meant or the chain to which our earth belongs?

A. The Builders are those who build and fashion things into a form. The term is equally applied to the Builders of the Universe and to the small globes like those of our chain. By planetary system our solar system alone is meant.

Sloka (2). WHERE WAS SILENCE? WHERE WERE THE EARS TO SENSE IT? NO! THERE WAS NEITHER SILENCE NOR SOUND.

Q. With reference to the following passage:—

"The idea that things can cease to exist and still BE, is a fundamental one in Eastern psychology. Under the apparent contradiction in terms, there rests a fact in Nature to realize which in the mind, rather than to argue about words is the important thing. A familiar instance of a similar paradox is afforded by chemical combination. The question whether Hydrogen and Oxygen cease to exist, when they combine to form water, is still a moot one."*

Would it be correct to say that what we perceive is a different "element" of the same substance? For example, when a substance is in the gaseous state, could we say that it is the element Air which is perceived, and that when combined to form water, oxygen and hydrogen appear under the guise of the Element Water, and when in the solid state, ice, we then perceive the element Earth?

A. The ignorant judge of all things by their appearance and not by what they are in reality. On this earth, of course, water is an element quite distinct from any other element, using the latter term in the sense of different manifestations of the one element. The root elements, Earth, Water, Air, Fire, are far more comprehensive states of differentiation. Such being the case, in Occultism Transubstantiation becomes a possibility, seeing that nothing which exists is in reality that which it is supposed to be.

Q. But oxygen which is usually found in its gaseous state, may be liquified and even solidified. When oxygen, then, is found

*S. D., I., 54.

in the gaseous condition, is it the occult element Air which is perceived, and when in the liquid condition the element Water, and in the solid state the element Earth?

A. Most assuredly: we have first of all the Element Fire, not the common fire, but the Fire of the Mediæval Rosicrucians, the one flame, the fire of Life. In differentiation this becomes fire in different aspects. Occultism easily disposes of the puzzle as to whether oxygen and hydrogen cease to exist when combined to form water. Nothing that is in the Universe can disappear from it. For the time being, then, these two gases when combined to form water, are *in abscondito*, but have not ceased to *be*. For, had they been annihilated, Science, by decomposing the water again into oxygen and hydrogen, would have created something out of nothing, and would, therefore, have no quarrel with Theology. Therefore, water is an element, if we choose to call it so, on this plane only. In the same way, oxygen and hydrogen in their turn can be split up into other more subtle elements, all being differentiation of one element or universal essence.

Q. Then all substances on the physical plane are really so many correlations or combinations of these root elements, and ultimately of the one element?

A. Most assuredly. In occultism it is always best to proceed from universals to particulars.

Q. Apparently, then, the whole basis of occultism lies in this, that there is latent within every man a power which can give him true knowledge, a power of perception of truth, which enables him to deal first hand with universals if he will be strictly logical and face the facts. Thus we can proceed from universals to particulars by this innate spiritual force which is in every man.

A. Quite so: this power is inherent in all, but paralyzed by our methods of education, and especially by the Aristotelian and Baconian methods. Hypothesis now reigns triumphant.

Q. It is curious to read Schopenhauer and Hartmann and mark how, step by step, by strict logic and pure reason, they have arrived at the same bases of thought that had been centuries ago adopted in India, especially by the Vedantin System. It may, however, be objected that they have arrived at this by the inductive method. But in Schopenhauer's case at any rate it was not so. He acknowledges himself that the idea came to him like a flash; having thus got his fundamental idea he set to work to arrange his facts, so that the reader imagines that what was in reality an intuitive idea, is a logical deduction drawn from the facts.

A. This is not only true of the Schopenhauerian philosophy, but also of all the great discoveries of modern times. How, for instance, did Newton discover the law of gravity? Was it not by the simple fall of an apple, and not by an elaborate series of experiments. The time will come when the Platonic method will not be so entirely ignored and men will look with favour on methods of education which will enable them to develop this most spiritual faculty.

FROM THE NOTE BOOK OF AN UNPOPULAR PHILOSOPHER*

I AM STERNLY REBUKED for some remarks made in the last number. My reflections with regard to the respective value of Mussulman and Christian pledges exchanged, as also on the doubtful propriety of zoological symbolism in the Churches—are pronounced wantonly wicked and calculated to hurt the tender feelings of Christian readers—if any. Protestant England—it is solemnly urged—is full of truly good men and women, of sincere church-goers, who "walk in the ways of the Lord." No doubt there are such, and no doubt they do, or try to, which is a step in advance of those who do not. But then none of the "righteous" need recognize their faces in the mirror presented by the "Unpopular Philosopher" only to the *unrighteous*. And again—

"THE WAYS OF THE LORD. . . . " The ways of *which* Lord? Is the jealous Lord of Moses meant, the God who thundered amidst the lightnings of Sinai, or the meek "Lord" of the Mount of Olives and Calvary? Is it the stern God that saith *"vengeance is mine,"* and who must be *"worshipped in fear,"* or the "man-God" who commanded *to love one's neighbours as oneself, to forgive one's enemies and bless those who revile us?* For the ways of the two Lords are wide apart, and can never meet.

No one who has studied the Bible can deny for one single moment that a large proportion (if *happily* not all) of modern Christians walk indeed "in the *ways* of the Lord"—Number I. This one is the "Lord" who *had respect unto Abel,* because the meat of his sacrifice smelt sweet in his nostrils; the "Lord" who commanded the Israelites to *spoil* the Egyptians of their jewels of silver and gold;[1] also to *"kill every male among the little ones,"* as *"every woman . . . but all the women children* (virgins) *to keep alive for themselves"* (Numb. XXXI., 17, *et seq.*); and to commit other actions too coarse to be repeated in any respectable publication.

Hence the modern warriors who achieve such feats (with the modern improvement occasionally, of shooting their enemies out of the mouths of big guns) walk, most undeniably, "in the ways" of the Lord of the Jews, but *never in the ways* of Christ. So does the modern trader who keeps the Sabbath most rigorously, attending Divine Service thrice on that day, after treating during the whole week his hired clerks as the brood of Ham "who shall be their (Shem and Japhet's) servants."

So does, likewise, he who helps himself, David-like, to a Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, without the least concern whether he simply robs or kills the Hittite husband. For he has every right to take for his sampler "a friend of God"—the *God* of the old covenant.

But will either of these pretend they walk in the ways of their Lord of the *new* Dispensation? Yet, he who raises his voice in a

---

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for November, 1887.

[1] And no doubt also the Anglo-Indians to *spoil* the King of Burmah of his?

protest against the "ways" of the Mosaic God, therefore, in favour of those preached by the very *antithesis* of Jehovah—the meek and gentle "Man of Sorrow"—he is forthwith set up on the pillory and denounced to public opprobrium as an *anti-Christian* and an Atheist! This, in the face of the words: *"Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven. . . . And every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand . . . and great was the fall thereof!"*

THE "WILL OF MY FATHER?" Is this "Father" identical with the God of Mount Sinai and of the Commandments? Then what is the meaning of the whole Chapter V. of Matthew, of the Sermon on the Mount, in which every one of these Commandments is virtually criticised and destroyed by the new amendments?

"Ye have heard that it hath been said 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth'; but I say unto you that you resist not evil," etc.

Glance at the big centres of our Christian civilisations. Look at the jails, the court and the prison-houses, the tribunals, and the police; see the distress, with starvation and prostitution as its results. Look at the host of the men of law and of judges; and then see how far the words of Christ, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, Judge not that ye be not judged," apply to the whole structure of our modern civilised life, and how far we may be called *Christians.*

How well the commandment—*"He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone"*—is now obeyed, may be seen by following day after day, the law reports for slander, calumny and defamation. Obedience to the injunction, and warning against the sin of offending children, *"these little ones,"* of whom is the Kingdom of Heaven, is found in the brutal treatment of fatherless children on the streets by the Christian police, of other children by their parents, and finally, in the merciless flogging of wee bits of culprits driven to crime by their own parents and starvation. And is it those who denounce such an anti-Christian spirit in legislation, the Pharisaical church and society, who shall be branded for speaking the truth? The magistrate, who has sworn on the Bible —contrary to Christ's express injunction—to administer justice; the pious defaulter, who swears falsely on it, but cannot be convicted; the sanctimonious millionaire who fattens on the blood and sweat of the poor; and the aristocratic "Jezebel" who casts mud from her carriage wheels on her "fallen" sister, on the street, a *victim perchance, of one of the men of her own high caste*—all these call themselves Christians. The *anti-Christians* are those who dare to look behind that veil of respectability.

The best answer to such paradoxical denunciation may be found in one of "Saladin's" admirable editorials. The reader must

turn to *The Secular Review* for October 22nd, 1887, and read some pertinent reflections on "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London," and the "Child-thieves" flogging. Well may a "heathen Chinee" or a "mild Hindu" shudder in horror at the picture in it of that "drawing of blood" out of the baby-bodies of infant thieves. The process is executed by a Christian policeman acting under the orders and in the presence of a righteous Christian magistrate. Has either of the two ever given a thought during the "child-torture" to the words of their Christ: *"Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and he were cast into the sea"?*

Yes, they *are* walking "in the ways of the God of Israel"! For, as *"it repented the Lord that he had made man"* so wicked and so imperfect, that "Lord" drowned and destroyed him "from the face of the Earth," without more ado. Verily so, *"both man and beast, and the creeping thing and the fowls,"* though the latter had neither sinned, nor were they "wicked." And why shouldn't the righteous men on Earth do likewise? It repents the Christian citizen of pious LUGDUNUM perchance also, that they create the starving little wretches, the foundlings abandoned to vice from the day of their birth? And the truly good Christian men, who would believe themselves damned to hell-fire were they to miss their Sabbath Service, forbidden by law to drown *their* creatures, resort to the next best thing they can; they "draw blood" from those little ones whom their "Saviour" and Master took under his special protection.

May the shadow of "Saladin" never grow less, for the fearless honest words of truth he writes:—

"And whose blood was in the veins of these two boys? Whose blood reddened the twigs of the birch? Peradventure that of the magistrate himself, or of the chaplain of the prison. For mystical are the grinding of the wheels of the mill of misery. And God looks on and tolerates. And I am accounted a heretic, and my anti-Christian writings are produced against me in a Court of Justice to prevent my getting justice, because I fail to see in all this how Christianity "elevates" woman and casts a "halo of sacred innocence round the tender years of the child." So be it. I have flung down my gage of battle, and the force of bigotry may break me to death; but it shall never bend me to submission. Unsalaried and ill-supported, I fight as stubbornly as if the world flung at my feet its gold and laurels and huzzas; for the weak need a champion and the wronged an avenger. It is necessary that Sham find an opponent and Hypocrisy a foe: these they will find in me, be the consequences what they may. "SALADIN."

This is the epitomized history of the "Unpopular Philosopher"; aye, the story of all those who, in the words of "Lara," know that "Christianity will never save humanity, but humanity may save Christianity," *i. e.*, the ideal spirit of the Christos-Buddha—of THEOSOPHY.

THE EARTH CHAIN OF GLOBES*

ALTHOUGH H. P. B. gave out to several of those who met her during the period from 1875 to 1878 the very same teachings in respect to the nature of man and of the "worlds" he evolves in as were afterwards publicly expounded in *Esoteric Buddhism* by Mr. Sinnett upon letters received by him through her from her Teachers, the credit of thus publishing those teachings, if such credit is desired, must be granted to that author. But at the time he began his publications, we who had known the doctrines so many years before wrote to H. P. B. complaining that the method adopted would lead to confusion on the one hand and to a materializing of the doctrines on the other, while, of course, no objection was made in general to the divulgement of what at a prior date had been given us in confidence, for he could not and would not have given the teachings to the public at all unless he had been permitted to do so. And after all these years the confusion to which our letters adverted has arisen among Theosophists, while there has been an apparent lack of attempt to clear it away. In respect to the "Earth Chain of Globes", the materializing of the doctrine and the confusion in the minds of students have been greater than in regard to any other of the teachings. This cloudiness I will now attempt to dissipate, if possible, with the help of some of H. P. B.'s own words in her book, the time having arrived and permission being granted, and access being also had to certain plain statements thereupon from the original sources.

In *Esoteric Buddhism,* 6th ed., p. 77, we find in reference to the "Chain of Globes":

> Separated as these are in regard to the grossly mechanical matter of which they consist, they are closely and intimately bound together by subtle currents and forces. . . . It is along these subtle currents that the life elements pass from world to world. . . . The most ethereal of the whole series. . . . As it passes from world Z back again to world A.

Then follows, for illustrative purposes, the figure of a series of tubs to represent the various globes of the whole series, one filling up from the overflow out of the preceding tub. Further, that the life wave *reaches* Globe A or B, and so on.

All this, in the absence of other explanations, and naturally consequent upon modern habits of thought, has fixed the idea in minds of many that the seven globes through which the evolution of man is carried on are in fact separated from each other; that they have between each other spaces along which currents flow to and from; and although the illustration of the series of tubs might be very well used for even the most metaphysical of problems, it had the effect of additionally deepening the idea of the actual separation from each other of the seven "globes". It has been thought that they were as much apart from each as any visible planet, although connected by "subtle currents and forces."

---

* This article was first printed in three parts by Wm. Q. Judge in *The Path* for February, March and April, 1893.

But the fact is otherwise. The seven globes of earth's chain are not separated at all, and are interblended and mixed with each other. To make it clearer, if we were to develop inner sight so as to perceive on the plane of the next globe, the fifth, it would not appear as a definite ball in the sky or space. Whether it be smaller or larger than this earth—a fact not yet cleared up—it would be seen to possess the earth as the earth holds it.

It may be asked, Why was this not told in the beginning? Because it was useless to tell, no one being at hand to understand it; and also because if insisted on—and it was not of enough importance to require insistence—the consequence might have been that even Mr. Sinnett would not have published his invaluable and extremely useful book. He confessed in that work that the doctrines propounded were new to him, and seemingly opposed to modern ideas of nature. In great part this was true, though there were very many who did not find them new, but who were not sufficient in number to risk then an insistence on a point that might too far violate the materialistic conceptions prevalent. Since then, however, times have altered, and a large and daily increasing number of minds are ready for the destruction of the idea contained in these words from the above quotation: *"Separated as these are in regard to the grossly mechanical matter of which they are composed."* Strike out this statement, and the rest of the explanation can be construed to agree with the facts as laid down by those who inspired the book.

The globes of the earth-chain are not "separated in regard to the grossly mechanical particles", but their particles are interblended. When we pass on to the plane of life which Globe 5 or E represents, it will be and appear to our then senses as gross, while the particles of this one will not be visible although still interblended with the other. It was to this very sentence that we objected in 1875, because it contains the statement of a fallacy growing out of materialistic conception.

On this very subject the teachers of H. P. B. wrote, *Secret Doctrine,* v. I, p. 166:*

> Were psychic and spiritual teachings more fully understood, it would be next to impossible to even imagine such an incongruity. . . . In short, as globes, they are in COADUNITION but not in CONSUBSTANTIALITY WITH OUR EARTH, and thus pertain to quite another state of consciousness."

This should be clear enough, and, as if to draw special attention to it, the very words which give the correct doctrine about our "fellow globes" were printed in capital letters.

"Consubstantiality" means *the state of being the same substance.* This is negatived in respect to the globes; but it is asserted that they, *being of different substances, are united in one mass,* for such is the meaning of "co-adunition". If this be the case, as must be on the original authority, it then follows that the "seven globes of earth's chain, while differing from each other as

*Reference is to Original Edition; in New Edition see p. 189.

to what is commonly called substance, are united together in a single mass. And when one is asked to shake off the dense veil of matter which beclouds the sight so as to perceive another of the globes, it is by no means meant that the companion globe, or globes as the case may be, would be seen rolling in space all by itself:"—and this is from another explanatory letter from the first authority. In the paragraph from *Secret Doctrine* attention is called to the fact that just because the seven globes are in co-adunition but not in consubstantiality with each other they pertain to a state of consciousness quite other than that we are compelled to be in now.

As H. P. B. used a diagram in which the globes are set down as separated, it only requires to be remembered that the system could not, on a flat surface by mere lines, be illustrated in any other way and be at all clear. Besides, all the diagrams and illustrations must be construed with the quotation on p. 166 in view, as well as the numerous pages of similar explanations.

Every student should make inquiry of himself to see what his ideas are on this subject, and revise them if they are found not to be in accord with what was so clearly explained in the words above quoted. For this lies at the root of many other difficulties. Materialistic conceptions on this will lead to materializing, localizing, and separating of states such as Devachan, and to perhaps dogmas about places that do not exist, when states of consciousness should be dwelt upon. For, as was written in a letter quoted by H. P. B.:

> Unless less trouble is taken to reconcile the irreconcileable—that is to say, the metaphysical and spiritual sciences with physical or natural philosophy, "natural" being a synonym to them [men of science] of that matter which falls under the perception of their corporeal senses—no progress can be really achieved.

And on page 169 of vol. I of *Secret Doctrine*† is a sentence not printed as a quotation, but which is really one from one of the same teacher's letters, reading:

> To be fully realized [the evolution of the monads on the globes] both this process and that of the birth of the globes must be examined far more from their metaphysical aspect than from what one might call a statistical standpoint.

Although the Lodge has declared through the mouth of H. P. B. that the complete truth on these matters is the heritage of future generations, yet we who are working in the movement now, believing in reïncarnation and knowing the force of Karmic tendencies, must not forget that we are destined to return in future years once more to the same work. We should therefore study the pure spiritual, psychic, and metaphysical aspects of the doctrines, leaving disputes with the changing science of the day to those who are amused by it. For those disputes are wholly unimportant, since they will all pass away; but the spirit of truth will not pass, nor shall we who endeavor to find her and to understand what she says to us.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

---

†Reference is to Original Edition; in New Edition see p. 192.

NO. II.

In February PATH the subject of the *coadunition* but *non-consubstantiality* of the seven globes of the Earth-chain was opened up slightly and discussed in view of certain expressions from the Adepts themselves on the same matter. Since then questions and doubts have arisen, as it seems that—as was suspected—the fundamental principles underlying this doctrine have not been clearly defined in the minds of all. And, indeed, before such clear definition is arrived at most if not all of the naturalistic and materialistic doctrines and modes of thought of the day will have to be abandoned. The true theory of the companion globes of our earth is one which cannot be fully comprehended if we are influenced, as many are, by the education which for centuries has been imposed upon us. When the Adepts say that these doctrines must be examined from a metaphysical standpoint, the nineteenth century person thinks that therefore it must be so vague and unreal as not to constitute an inclusion of facts since "facts" are hard and visible things, so to say.

The first question, coming from one who grasps to a great extent the theory broached in the paragraph from the Master's pen quoted in *Secret Doctrine,* is whether we will be able to see but one globe at a time as we change our centre of consciousness? That is to say, seeing that we now can perceive the earth with the eye and none of the other companions, does it follow from this that, when the race ceases to function on the earth and has taken up evolution on the next globe in order, we shall see then but that globe and none of the others of the chain among which will then be included this earth? It by no means follows that we then shall be able to see but one, but to what extent our then vision will be stretched or how many other globes we shall be able to see has not been given out publicly by the Masters, and it is held that alone in the keeping of the Lodge is the knowledge on this detail of the doctrine. We are left therefore to our own deductions, to be drawn from known facts. No very substantial benefit could be derived from exact knowledge about it, as it relates to matters and states of life removed from us inconceivably far both as to time and consciousness. Nor would a full explanation be comprehended. One of the teachers has written:

> You do not seem to realize the tremendous difficulties in the way of imparting even the rudiments of *our* science to those who have been trained in the familiar methods of (modern science). You do not see that the more you have of the one the less capable you are to instinctively comprehend the other, for a man can only think in his worn grooves, and unless he has *the courage to fill up these and make new ones for himself* [italics are mine] he must perforce travel on the old lines. . . . Such is, unfortunately, the inherited and self-acquired grossness of the Western mind, and so greatly have the very phrases expressive of modern thought been developed in the line of practical Materialism, that it is now next to impossible either for them to comprehend or for us to express in their own languages anything of that delicate, seemingly ideal, machinery of the occult cosmos. To some little extent that faculty can be acquired by the Europeans through study and meditation, but—that's all. And here is the bar which has hitherto prevented a

conviction of the Theosophical truths from gaining currency among Western nations—caused Theosophical study to be cast aside as useless and fantastic.

As implied in the foregoing, the reason for not telling all about it is that it would not be comprehended, and not that the Lodge desires to keep it back from the world. The same difficulty has often been encountered by ordinary clairvoyants who have tried to give an account of the little they know of the "occult cosmos" to hearers whose modes of thought were purely materialistic or tainted by that kind of education. And I have met estimable theosophists who said to me that if they really were convinced that I believed certain things which I hinted to them they would be forced in sadness to conclude I was a most superstitious person—meaning of course that their ignorance and inability would constitute my superstition.

But as we now reside in a physical body perfectly visible to us, and as the astral body is sometimes seen by certain persons, it follows most surely that some persons can now see another body or form of matter while functioning in their little earth. The fact that all do not see the astral body only proves that as yet the seeing of it is not normal for the whole human race. And looking at the other side of the matter, we know that sometimes persons escaped temporarily from the physical body and functioning wholly in the astral have been able to see the physical one as it slept in trance. From this we may conclude that when the race has gone to some other centre of consciousness called a globe, it may possibly be able to see another of the companions in the sky. This is made more probable from the fact that the Earth is the lowest or at the turning of the circle, and for that reason it is on its own plane and not in company as to plane with any other one. The others might be two at a time on the one plane and then visible to each other.

The next point raised is that if the article of February is accepted, then it results that we consider the companion globes to be only "phases of the Earth". The letter from the Master above quoted is pertinent here, for this objection arises solely and wholly from a materialistic education leading the objector to give the first place of importance to the earth, just as if it were not possible to say that earth is a phase of the other globes.

The globes are not in any sense phases of each other, but are "phases of consciousness." The consciousness alters and we function in another state of matter, in the same place, but not able to see the state of matter we have left. And as now the whole race is bound up by its total form and quality of consciousness, the units of it are compelled to remain in the general state of consciousness until the race progress permits an advance or change to another. In the evolution of the race it develops new senses and instruments for perception, but these proceed along with the changing centre of consciousness, and are not the causes for the latter but are effects due to the operation and force of that inner power of perceiving which at last compels nature to furnish the necessary instrument.

When the new instruments are all perfected, then the whole race moves on to another plane altogether.

All this supports and enforces the doctrine of universal brotherhood upon which the Adepts have insisted. For the changing of consciousness as to centre is not for the benefit of the individual, but is permissible and possible when the whole mass of matter of the globe whereon the beings are evolving has been perfected by the efforts and work of the most advanced of the whole number, and that advanced class is man. If it were otherwise, then we should see millions upon millions of selfish souls deserting the planet as soon as they had acquired the necessary new senses, leaving their fellows and the various kingdoms of nature to shift for themselves. But the law and the Lodge will not permit this, but insist that we shall remain until the lower masses of atoms have been far enough educated to be able to go on in a manner not productive of confusion. Here again we trench upon the materialism of the age, which will roar with laughter at the idea of its being possible to educate the atoms.

The doctrine of the interpenetration of the planes of matter lies at the root of clairvoyance, clairaudience, and all such phenomena. Clairvoyance would be an impossibility were it not the fact that what for the ordinary sense is solid and an obstacle to sight is in reality for the other set of senses non-existent, free from solidity, and no obstacle. Otherwise clear seeing is impossible, and the learned doctors are right who say we are all deluded and never did any one see through a solid wall. For while the faculty of imagination is necessary for the training of the power to see through a solid wall, we could not so perceive merely by imagination, since objects must have a medium through which they are to be seen. This again strikes against materialistic conceptions, for the "objective" usually means that which can be seen and felt. But in the machinery of the "occult cosmos" the objective is constantly changing to the subjective and *vice versâ*, as the centre of consciousness changes. In the trance or clairvoyant state the subjective of the waking man has become the objective. So also in dreams. There, clothed with another body of finer texture, the perceiver finds all the experiences objective as to their circumstances and subjective as to the feelings they produce on the perceiver who registers the sensations. And in precisely similar manner will the race see, feel, and know when it has changed all and begins to function on another globe.

WILLIAM BREHON.

NO. III.

The Editor has handed me a communication from a reader upon this subject which I insert here, as it on the one hand shows a very common defect of students—inaccuracy of reading, thought, and reference, and on the other will serve as a question which arises in other minds. It reads:

Please state in reference to the *Earth Chain of Globes* whether it is meant to be conveyed on page 159 of *S. D.* Vol. I* that the "seven globes from the 1st to the 7th proceed in seven Rounds," that *each* globe *revolves seven times around the World Chain with its own particular development* [say *the Mineral Kingdom*], before the next in order [say the Vegetable Kingdom] appears on Globe A? Or does the Mineral Kingdom only go *once* around the World Chain from 1 to 7? In *Esoteric Buddhism,* Page 91, it is stated that the several kingdoms pass "*several times* around the whole circle as minerals, and then again *several times* as vegetables," but there is no distinct statement of this in *S. D.*—Yours, IGNOTUS.

Inaccuracies like those in the foregoing are not uncommon. They are constant and all-pervading. It is probably the fault of modern education, accentuated by the reading of a vast amount of superficial literature such as is poured out day by day. Any close observer can detect the want of attention displayed in metaphysical studies in contrast with the particular care given to matters of business and practical affairs of life. All those who are studying Theosophy ought to make themselves aware of this national defect, and therefore give the strictest attention to what they read upon metaphysics and devote less attention to the amount of such reading than to thinking upon what is read.

In the first place, the *Secret Doctrine* does not say on the page quoted, nor any where else, what "Ignotus" writes. Instead of reading as quoted, the passage is:

I. Everything in the metaphysical as in the physical Universe is septenary [p. 158].† . . . *The evolution of life proceeds on these* seven globes *or bodies* from the first to the seventh in Seven Rounds or Seven Cycles [p. 159].

I insert in italics the omitted words, the word *proceeds* having been put out of its place by "Ignotus". The error makes a completely new scheme, one unphilosophical and certainly not given out by the Masters. But though some may wonder why I notice such a false assumption, it is right to take it up because it must have arisen through carelessness, yet of such a sort as might perpetuate an important error. It follows from the restoration of the passage that the Globes do not "revolve around the world chain". The supposition of the correspondent is not peculiar among the many hurried ones made by superficial readers. He first assumed that the various globes of the Earth-Chain revolved, in some way which he did not stop to formulate, in seven rounds—I presume in some imaginary orbit of their own—in what he called the "world chain", and then he went on adapting the rest of the evolutionary theory to this primary assumption. By reading the *Secret Doctrine* and the former articles on this subject in the PATH, the point in question will be made clear. Evolution of the monad, which produces and underlies all other evolutions, proceeds on the seven planetary bodies of any chain of evolution. These seven places or spheres for such evolution represent different states of consciousness, and hence, as written in the *Secret Doctrine* and attempted to

*Reference is to Original Edition; in New Edition see p. 182.
†p. 158 Original Edition; p. 182 New Edition.

be shown in these articles, they may and do interpenetrate each other with beings on each. Therefore all such words as "round", "around", "chain", and the like must be examined metaphysically and not be allowed to give the mind a false notion such as is sure to arise if they are construed in the material way and from their materialistic derivation. "To go around" the seven globes does not mean that one passes necessarily from one place to another, but indicates a change from one condition to another, just as we might say that a man "went the whole round of sensations".

As to the other questions raised, *Esoteric Buddhism* is right in saying that the monads pass *several* times around the globes as minerals and vegetables, but wisely does not make the number and order very definite. In the *Secret Doctrine* one of the Masters writes that at the second round the order of the appearance of the human kingdom alters, but the letter goes no farther on that point except to say, as is very definitely put in the *Secret Doctrine* on p. 159, para. 4;*

> The Life Cycle . . . arrived on our Earth at the commencement of the fourth in the present series of life-cycles. Man is the first form that appears thereon, being preceded only by the mineral and vegetable kingdoms—even the latter *having to develop and continue its further evolution through man.*

This states quite distinctly (a) that after the second round the order alters, and (b) that in the fourth round, instead of animals appearing as the first moving forms for the monads to inhabit, the human form comes first, preceded by mineral and vegetable, and followed by the brute-animal.

This change always comes on at any fourth round, or else we never could have evolutionary perfection. Other monads come originally from other spheres of evolution. In a new one such as this the preliminary process and order of mineral, plant, animal, human must be followed. But having in two or three rounds perfected itself in the task, the monad brings out the human form at the turning point, so that man as the model, means, guide, and savior may be able to intelligently raise up not only humanity but as well every other kingdom below the human. This is all made very clear and positive by repeated statement and explanation in the *Secret Doctrine*, and it is a matter for surprise that so many Theosophists do not understand it.

For fear that the present may be misunderstood I will add. Although the order of appearance of the human form alters as stated, this does not mean that the whole number of natural kingdoms does not make the sevenfold pilgrimage. They all make it, and in every round up to and including the seventh there are present in the chain of globes elemental, mineral, vegetable, animal, and human forms constituting those kingdoms, but of course the minerals and vegetables of the seventh round and race will be a very different sort from those of the present.

---

*Reference is to Original Edition; see p. 183 New Edition.

But as what a Master has said hereon is far better than my weak words, I will refer to that. Thus:

> Nature consciously prefers that matter should be indestructible under organic rather than inorganic forms, and works slowly but incessantly towards the realization of this object—the evolution of conscious life out of inert material.

WILLIAM BREHON.

WHAT SHOULD THEOSOPHISTS TALK ABOUT?*

WHEN two or three or more Theosophists meet together socially, what should they talk about in the absence of uninterested strangers? It may be said that they should talk like any other people, but this ought not to be the case. The usual worldly custom is to bring up for conversation unimportant matters, often in regard to persons, not infrequently to their detriment, or in regard to transient events, and to discuss these without relating them to permanent and basic principles. Many people talk for the sake of talking, as others read for the sake of reading, regardless of results. But those who know that a "single word may ruin a whole city or put the spirit of a lion into a dead fox" will be more careful of their words. Apart from that aspect of the question, it should be evident that for people who profess to be interested in Theosophy to meet together without discussing it is to fritter away their time and opportunity. To babble out words does not help on the evolution of humanity or inspire any other idea but the natural one that such conversation borders on the idiotic. Nor is there any reason why conversation should not be at once interesting and instructive. It can easily be led into such channels by anyone present. No one has a right to excuse himself on the ground that "the others" would talk gossip, or about clothes or games or similar things; for a few words and, more important still, a proper attitude of mind will at once lead the conversation into the proper channel. And here again any extreme should be avoided. There is a right time and a wrong time for the discussion of games, clothes, food, and so forth, and there is a decided limit to the usefulness of such discussion. Other topics should be dealt with when fellow students are so fortunate as to meet together. They at least should never part without conversing on some ennobling and uplifting subject that will help them in their work and study. To make that a rule would not only insure much positive good; it would insure against much positive harm.

---

* This extract formed a portion of an article entitled "The Screen of Time," written by Wm. Q. Judge, and first printed in *Theosophy*—successor to *The Path*, for April, 1896. The title given it is our own. [ED. THEOSOPHY]

"BLAVATSKIANISM" IN AND OUT OF SEASON*

THEOSOPHISTS! let us consult together. Let us survey the army, the field of battle, and the fighters. Let us examine our ways and our speech, so that we may know what we are doing in this great affray which may last for ages and in which every act has a future. What do we see? A Theosophical Society struggling as a whole against the world. A few devoted members struggling against the world and some opponents within its ranks. A Society grown to its eighteenth year, after the expenditure of much time and energy and fame by those who have been with it in infancy, those who have come in from time to time, those who worked and left it for this generation. It has its karma like any other body, for it is a living thing and not a mere paper organization; and with that karma is also woven the karma of the units composing it.

How does it live and grow? Not alone by study and work, but by propriety of method of work; by due attention paid by the members to thought and speech in their theosophic promulgations. Wise workers, like wise generals, survey the field now and then to see if their methods are good or bad, even though fully convinced of the nobility and righteousness of their cause; they trust not only to the virtue of their aim and work, but attend to any defects now and then indicated by the assaults of the enemy; they listen to warnings of those who see or think they see errors of omission and commission. Let us all do this.

It happens to be the fact that most of those who work the hardest for the Society are at the same time devoted disciples, open or non-professed, of H. P. Blavatsky, but that leaves still a large number of members who, with the first-named, may be variously classified. First, there are those who do not rely at all on H. P. Blavatsky, while not distinctly opposed and none the less good members. Next are those who are openly opposed to her name and fame, who, while reading her works and profiting by them as well as by the work aroused by her in others, are averse from hearing her name, oppose the free assertion of devotion to her, would like now and then to have Theosophy stripped of her altogether, and opine that many good and true possible members are kept away from the T. S. by her personality's being bound up in it. The two last things of course are impossible to meet, because if it had not been for her the Theosophical Society with its literature would not have come into existence. Lastly are those in the world who do not belong to our ranks, composed of persons holding in respect to the T. S. the various positions of for, against, and indifferent.

---

* This article was first printed in *Lucifer* for December, 1893.

The active workers may be again divided as follows:

(*a*) Moderate ones, good thinkers who present their thoughts in words that show independent and original thought on theosophical subjects, thus not referring to authority, yet who are not earnest, devoted and loyal.

(*b*) Those who are earnest, devoted and loyal, but present Theosophy more or less as quotations from H. P. B.'s writings, constantly naming and always referring their thoughts and conclusions to her, thus appearing to present Theosophy as solely based on her as an authority.

(*c*) The over-zealous who err like the former, and, in addition, too frequently and out of place and time, bring forward the name of H. P. Blavatsky; often relating what it was supposed she had done or not done, and what she said, attributing infallibility to her either directly or by indirection; thus arousing an opposition that is added to any impression of dogmatism or authority produced by other members.

(*d*) Believers in phenomena who give prominence to the wonders said to have been performed by H. P. Blavatsky; who accentuate the value of the whole field of occult phenomena, and sincerely supposing, however mistaken the notion, that occult and psychical phenomena will arrest attention, draw out interest, inspire confidence; when, in fact, the almost certain results are, to first arouse curiosity, then create distrust and disappointment; for nearly every one is a doubting Thomas who requires, while the desire cannot be satisfied, a duplicate of every phenomenon for himself. In *The Occult World,* the Adept writing on this very subject says that the demand for new phenomena would go on *crescendo* until at last one would be crushed by doubt, or the other and worse result of creating superstition and blind faith would come about. Every thoughtful person must surely see that such must be the consequence.

It is true that the movement has grown most in consequence of the effort of those who are devoted to an ideal, inspired by enthusiasm, filled with a lasting gratitude to H. P. Blavatsky. Their ideal is the service of Humanity, the ultimate potential perfectibility of man as exemplified by the Masters and Adepts of all ages, including the present. Their enthusiasm is born from the devotion which the ideal arouses, their gratitude is a noble quality engendered by the untiring zeal of the soul who brought to their attention the priceless gems of the wisdom religion. Ingratitude is the basest vice of which man can be guilty, and it will be base for them to receive the grand message and despise the messenger.

But does devotion, loyalty, or gratitude require that we should thrust our estimate of a person forward to the attention of the public in a way that is certain to bring on opposition? Should our work in a great movement, meant to include all men, intended to condense the truth from all religions, be impeded or imperilled by over-zealous personal loyalty? I think not. We should be wise as

serpents. Wisdom does not consist in throwing the object of our heart's gratitude in the faces of those who have no similar feeling, for when we do that it may easily result that personal considerations will nullify our efforts for the good of those we address.

Now it is charged in several quarters that we are dogmatic as a Society. This is extremely easy of disproof as a fact, and some trouble has been taken to disprove it. But is there not a danger that we might go too far on this line, and by continuing the disproof too long increase the very belief which we say is baseless? "The more proof offered the less believed" is how often true. Our constitution is the supreme law. Its being non-dogmatic is proof enough. Years of notification on almost every document have prepared the proofs which every one can see. It would seem that enough has been said on the subject of our non-dogmatism.

But the charge then is altered, and "dogmatism" is supplanted by "Blavatskianism," and here the critics have a slight ground to stand on; here is where a danger may exist and where the generals, the captains, the whole army, should properly pay attention and be on their guard. In the words and methods of the various classes of members above mentioned is the cause for the charge. I am not directing any remarks to the question whether members "believe in Blavatsky or not," for the charge made is intended to imply that there is too much said about H. P. Blavatsky as authority, as source, as guide, too little original thinking, too much reliance on the words of a single person.

In the years that are gone, necessity existed for repelling mean personal attacks on H. P. Blavatsky's character. To take up arms in her behalf then was wise. Now her works remain. The necessity for constant repulse of attacks on her does not exist. Judgment can be used in doing so. Loyalty is not thrown to the winds when good judgment says there is no need to reply. One of the best replies is to carry on the work in the noble and altruistic spirit she always pointed out. Take, for instance, the almost senile attacks periodically made by the Society for Psychical Research. What good can be possibly accomplished by paying any attention to them? None at all, except what results to that body by inflating it with the idea that its shafts have hit a vulnerable spot. Ever since their *ex post facto* agent went to India to play at psychical investigation they have almost lived by their attacks, for by them, more than anything else, they gain some attention; her personality, even to this day, adds spice to their wide-of-the-mark discussions. Even at the Chicago World's Congresses their discussions were mostly given up to re-hashing the same stories, as if they were proud that, even though they knew nothing of psychic law, they had at least discovered one human being whose nature they could not fathom, and desired to for ever parade her with the various labels their fancy suggested. But in districts or new publications, where a new attack is made, good judgment may suggest an answer bringing up the statement of charges and copiousness of former

answers. Now our work goes on in meetings, in publications, in discussions, and here is where the old idea of repelling attack may run into an unnecessary parade of the person to whom in heart we are loyal, while at the same time the voluminousness of her writings is often an excuse for not investigating for oneself, and this leads to quoting her too frequently by name as authority.

She never claimed authority, but, contrariwise, disclaimed it. But few of the theories broached by her were new to our day, albeit those are the key-ideas. Yet these very key-ideas are not those on which the quotations and personal references to her are made so often. She neither invented, nor claimed as new, the doctrines of Karma, Reïncarnation, Devachan, Cycles, and the like. These are all exhaustively treated in various literatures—Buddhistic, Jain, Brâhmanical, Zoroastrian. They are capable, like all theosophic doctrines, of independent examination, of philosophical, logical, and analogical proof. But, if we state them parrot-like, and then bring forward a quotation from H. P. Blavatsky to prove them, has not an opponent, has not any one, member or non-member, a right to say that the offending person is not doing independent thinking, is not holding a belief after due consideration, but is merely acting blindly on faith in matters where blind faith is not required? And if many members do the same thing, it is quite natural that a cry should be raised by some one of "Blavatskianism."

If this were an age in the West when any respect or reverence existed as a general thing in the people, the sayings of a sage could be quoted as authority. But it is not such an age. Reverence is paralyzed for the time, and the words of a sage are of no moment as such. H. P. Blavatsky came in this irreverent time, holding herself only as a messenger and indicator, not as a sage pure and simple. Hence to merely quote her words out of due place will but arouse a needless irritation. It may indicate in oneself a failure to think out the problem independently, an absence of diligence in working out our own salvation in the way directed by Gautama Buddha. What, then, are the right times and places, and which are out of place and time?

When the assembly and the subject are both meant to deal with the life and works of H. P. Blavatsky, then it is right and proper and wise to speak of her and her works, her acts, and words. If one is dealing with an analysis or compilation of her writings on any subject, then must she and what she wrote be used, named, and quoted. But even at those times her words should not be quoted as and for authority, inasmuch as she said they were not. Those who consider them to be authority will quickly enough accept them. As she never put forward anything as original investigation of hers in the realm of science, in the line of experiments in hypnotism, in clairvoyance, mind-reading, or the like, we ought to be careful how and when we bring her statements forward to an unbelieving public.

But in an assembly of members coming together to discuss theosophical doctrines in general, say such as Karma, Reïncarnation, the Septenary Constitution, and the like, it is certainly unwise to give quotation after quotation from H. P. Blavatsky's works on the matter in hand. This is not fair to the hearers, and it shows only a power of memory or compilation that argues nothing as to the comprehension of the subject on the reader's part. It is very easy to compile, to quote sentence after sentence, to weave a long series of extracts together, but it is not progress, nor independence, nor wisdom. On the other hand, it is a complete nullification of the life-work of the one who has directed us to the path; it is contrary to the spirit and genius of the Society. And if in such an assembly much time is given to recounting phenomena performed by H. P. B., or telling how she once said this and at another time did that, the time is out of joint with the remarks. Meetings of branches are meant for giving to the members and enquirers a knowledge of theosophical doctrines by which alone true progress is to come to our movement. New and good members are constantly needed; they cannot be fished out of the sea of enquirers by such a process as the personal history of anyone, they cannot be retained by relations of matters that do not teach them the true aim and philosophy of life, they will be driven off if assailed with quotations.

If there is power in a grateful loyalty to H. P. Blavatsky, as for my part I fully believe, it does not have its effect by being put forward all the time, or so often as to be too noticeable, but from its depth, its true basis, its wise foundation, its effect on our work, our act, and thought. Hence to my mind there is no disloyalty in reserving the mention of her name and qualities for right and timely occasions. It is certain that as Theosophy brings forward no new system of ethics, but only enforces the ethics always preached, the claim, if made, that our ethics, our high endeavour, are to be found nowhere else described save in the works left by H. P. Blavatsky, is baseless, will lead to wrong conclusions, and bring up a reäction that no amount of argument can suppress. No greater illustration of an old and world-wide religion can be found than that provided by Buddhism, but what did Buddha say to his disciples when they brought up the question of the honours to be paid to his remains? He told them not to hinder themselves about it, not to dwell on it, but to work out their own salvation with diligence.*

That the views held by H. P. Blavatsky herself coïncided with this can be seen by reading the pamphlet entitled *The Theosophical Society and H. P. B.*, being a reprint of articles that appeared in LUCIFER of December, 1890. She requested the reprint, and some of her notes are appended to the articles. In those Bro. Patterson took somewhat the same ground as this article, and she commended it in most positive terms.

— WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

* See the *Mahaparinibbana Sutta.*

STAR-ANGEL-WORSHIP IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH*

[The subject matter of the present article has not been chosen from any desire of "finding fault" with the Christian *religion,* as LUCIFER is often accused of doing. No special animosity is felt towards popery any more than against any other existing dogmatic and ritualistic faith. We merely hold that "there is no higher religion than truth." Hence, being incessantly attacked by the Christians—among whom none are so bitter and *contemptuous* as the Romanists—who call us "idolators" and "heathens," and otherwise denounce us, it is necessary that at times something should be said in our defence, and truth re-established.

The Theosophists are accused of believing in Astrology, and the *Devas* (Dhyan Chohans) of the Hindus and Northern Buddhists. A too impulsive missionary in the Central Provinces of India has actually called us "Astrolaters," "Sabians" and "*devil*-worshippers." This, as usual, is an unfounded calumny and a misrepresentation. No theosophist, no *Occultist* in the true sense of the word has ever *worshipped* Devas, Nats, Angels or even *planetary* spirits. Recognition of the *actual existence* of such Beings—which, however exalted, are still gradually evolved *creatures* and finite—and even reverence for some of them is not *worship*. The latter is an elastic word, one that has been made threadbare by the poverty of the English tongue. We address a magistrate as his "worship," but it can hardly be said that we pay to him *divine* honours. A mother often worships her children, a husband his wife, and *vice versa,* but none of these prays to the object of his worship. But in neither case does it apply to the Occultists. An Occultist's reverence for certain high Spirits may be very great in some cases; aye, perhaps even as great as the reverence felt by some Christians for their Archangels Michael and Gabriel and their (St.) George of Cappadocia—the learned purveyor of Constantine's armies. But it stops there. For the Theosophists these planetary "angels" occupy no higher place than that which Virgil assigns them:

> "They boast ethereal vigour and are form'd
> From seeds of heavenly birth,"

as does also every mortal. Each and all are occult potencies having sway over certain attributes of nature. And, if once attracted to a mortal, they do help him in certain things. Yet, on the whole, the less one has to do with them the better.

Not so with the Roman Catholics, our pious detractors. The Papists worship them and have rendered to them *divine homage* from the beginning of Christianity to this day, and in the full acceptation of the italicised words, as this article will prove. Even for the Protestants, the Angels in general, if not the Seven Angels of the Stars particularly—are "Harbingers of the Most High" and "Ministering Spirits" to whose protection they appeal, and who have their distinct place in the Book of Common Prayer.

The fact that the Star and Planetary Angels are worshipped by the Papists is not generally known. The cult had many vicissitudes. It was several times abolished, then again permitted. It is the short history of its growth, its last re-establishment and the recurrent efforts to proclaim this worship openly, of which a brief sketch is here attempted. This worship may be regarded for the last few years as *obsolete,* yet to this day it was never abolished. Therefore it will now be my pleasure to prove that if anyone deserves the name of "idolatrous," it is not the Theosophists, Occultists, Kabalists and Astrologers, but, indeed, most of the Christians; those

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for July, 1888.

Roman Catholics, who, besides the Star-angels, worship a Kyriel of more or less problematical saints and the Virgin Mary, of whom their Church has made a regular *goddess*.

The short bits of history that follow are extracted from various trustworthy sources, such as the Roman Catholics will find it rather difficult to gainsay or repudiate. For our authorities are (*a*), various documents *in the archives of the Vatican;* (*b*), sundry works by pious and well-known Roman Catholic writers, Ultramontanes to the backbone—lay and ecclesiastical authors; and finally (*c*), a Papal Bull, than which no better evidence could be found.]

IN the middle of the VIII. century of the Christian era the very notorious Archbishop Adalbert of Magdeburg, famous as few in the annals of magic, appeared before his judges. He was charged with, and ultimately convicted—by the second Council of Rome presided over by Pope Zacharia—of using during his performances of ceremonial magic the names of the "seven Spirits"—then at the height of their power in the Church—among others, that of URIEL, with the help of whom he had succeeded in producing his greatest phenomena. As can be easily shown, *the church is not against magic proper,* but only against those magicians who fail to conform to her methods and rules of evocation. However, as the wonders wrought by the Right Reverend Sorcerer were not of a character that would permit of their classification among "miracles by the grace, and to the glory of God," they were declared *unholy*. Moreover, the Archangel URIEL (lux et ignis) having been compromised by such exhibitions, his name had to be discredited. But, as such a disgrace upon one of the "Thrones" and "Messengers of the Most High" would have reduced the number of these Jewish *Saptarshis* to only six, and thus have thrown into confusion the whole celestial hierarchy, a very clever and crafty subterfuge was resorted to. It was, however, neither new, nor has it proved very convincing or efficacious.

It was declared that Bishop Adalbert's Uriel, the "fire of God," was not the Archangel mentioned in the second Book of Esdras; nor was he the glorious personage so often named in the magical books of Moses—especially in the 6th and 7th. The sphere or planet of this original Uriel was said, by Michael Glycas the Byzantine, to be the Sun. How then could this exalted being—the friend and companion of Adam in Eden before his fall, and, later, the chum of Seth and Enoch, as all pious Christians know—how could he ever have given a helping hand to sorcery? Never, never! the idea alone was absurd.

Therefore, the Uriel so revered by the Fathers of the Church, remained as unassailable and as immaculate as ever. It was a *devil* of the same name—an obscure devil, one must think, since he is nowhere mentioned—who had to pay the penalty of Bishop Adalbert's little transactions in black magic. This "*bad*" Uriel is, as

a certain tonsured advocate has tried hard to insinuate, connected with a certain significant word of occult nature, used by and known only to Masons of a very high degree. Ignorant of the "word" itself, however, the defender has most gloriously failed to prove his version.

Such whitewashing of the archangel's character was of course necessary in view of the special worship paid to him. St. Ambrosius had chosen Uriel as a patron and paid him almost divine reverence.* Again the famous Father Gastaldi, the Dominican monk, writer and Inquisitor, had proven in his curious work "On the Angels" *(De Angelis)* that the worship of the "Seven Spirits" by the Church had been and was *legal* in all the ages; and that it was necessary for the moral support and faith of the children of the (Roman) Church. In short that he who should neglect these gods was as bad as any "heathen" who did not.

Though sentenced and suspended, Bishop Adalbert had a formidable party in Germany, one that not only defended and supported the sorcerer himself, but also the disgraced Archangel. Hence, the name of Uriel was left in the missals after the trial, the "Throne" merely remaining "under suspicion." In accordance with her admirable policy the Church having declared that the "blessed Uriel," had nought to do with the "accursed Uriel" of the Kabalists, the matter rested there.

To show the great latitude offered to such subterfuges, the occult tenets about the celestial Hosts have only to be remembered. The world of Being begins with the Spiritual Fire (or Sun) and its seven "Flames" or Rays. These "Sons of Light," called the "multiple" because, allegorically speaking they belong to, and lead a simultaneous existence in heaven and on earth, easily furnished a handle to the Church to hang her *dual* Uriel upon. Moreover, Devas, Dhyan-Chohans, Gods and Archangels are all identical and are made to change their Protean forms, names and positions, *ad libitum*. As the sidereal gods of the Sabians became the kabalistic and talmudistic angels of the Jews with their esoteric names unaltered, so they passed bag and baggage into the Christian Church as the archangels, exalted only in their office.

These names are their "mystery" titles. So mysterious are they, indeed, that the Roman Catholics themselves are not sure of them, now that the Church, in her anxiety to hide their humble origin, has changed and altered them about a dozen times. This is what the pious de Mirville confesses:

"To speak with precision and certainty, as we might like to, about everything in connection with their (the angels') names and attributes is not an easy task. . . . For when one has said that these Spirits are the *seven assistants* that surround the throne of the Lamb and form its seven *horns;* that the famous seven-branched

* *De Fide ad gratiam.* Book III.

candlestick of the Temple was their type and symbol . . . when we have shown them figured in *Revelation* by the *seven stars* in the Saviour's hand, or by the angels letting loose the *seven plagues*—we shall but have stated once more one of those incomplete truths which we have to handle with such caution." *(Of the Spirits before their Fall).*

Here the author utters a great truth. He would have uttered one still greater, though, had he added that *no truth*, upon *any subject* whatever, has been ever made complete by the Church. Otherwise, where would be the mystery so absolutely necessary to the authority of the ever incomprehensible dogmas of the Holy "Bride"?

These "Spirits" are called *primarii principles*. But what these first Principles are in reality is not explained. In the first centuries of Christianity the Church would not do so; and in this one she knows of them no more than her faithful lay sons do. She has lost the secret.

The question concerning the definite adoption of names for these angels, de Mirville tells us—"has given rise to controversies that have lasted for centuries. To this day *these seven names are a mystery.*"

Yet they are found in certain missals and in the secret documents at the Vatican, along with the astrological names known to many. But as the Kabalists, and among others Bishop Adalbert, have used some of them, the Church will not accept these titles, though she worships the creatures. The usual names accepted are *Mikael*, the "*quis ut Deus*," the "like unto God"; GABRIEL, the "strength (or power) of God"; RAPHAEL, or "divine virtue"; URIEL, "God's light and fire"; SCALTIEL, the "speech of God"; JEHUDIEL, the "praise of God" and BARACHIEL, the "blessing of God." These "seven" are *absolutely canonical*, but they are not the true mystery names—the magical POTENCIES. And even among the "substitutes," as just shown, Uriel has been greatly compromised and the three last enumerated are pronounced "suspicious." Nevertheless, though nameless, they are still worshipped. Nor is it true to say that no trace of these three names—so "suspicious"—is anywhere found in the Bible, for they are mentioned in certain of the old Hebrew scrolls. One of them is named in Chapter XVI. of Genesis—the angel who appears to Hagar; and all the three appear as "the Lord" (the Elohim) to Abraham in the plains of Mamre, as the "three men" who announced to Sarai the birth of Isaac (*Genesis*, XVIII). "Jehudiel," moreover, is distinctly named in Chapter XXIII. of *Exodus*, as the angel in whom was "the name" (*praise* in the original) of God (*Vide* verse 21). It is through their "divine attributes," which have led to the formation of the names, that these archangels may be identified by an easy esoteric method of transmutation with the Chaldean great gods and even

with the Seven Manus and the Seven Rishis of India.* They are the *Seven* Sabian Gods, and the *Seven* Seats (Thrones) and Virtues of the Kabalists; and now they have become with the Catholics, their "Seven Eyes of the Lord," and the "Seven *Thrones*," instead of "Seats."

Both Kabalists and "Heathen" must feel quite flattered to thus see their Devas and Rishis become the "Ministers Plenipotentiary" of the Christian God. And now the narrative may be continued unbroken.

Until about the XVth century after the misadventure of Bishop Adalbert, the names of only the first three Archangels out of the seven stood in the Church in their full odour of sanctity. The other four remained ostracised—*as names.*

Whoever has been in Rome must have visited the privileged temple of the Seven Spirits, especially built for them by Michael Angelo: the famous church known as "St. Mary of the Angels." Its history is curious but very little known to the public that frequents it. It is worthy, however, of being recorded.

In 1460, there appeared in Rome a great "Saint," named Amadœus. He was a nobleman from Lusitania, who already in Portugal had become famous for his prophecies and beatific visions.[1] During one of such he had a revelation. The seven Archangels appeared to the holy man, so beloved by the Pope that Sixtus IV. had actually permitted him to build on the site of St. Peter *in Montorio* a Franciscan monastery. And having appeared they revealed to him their genuine *bona fide* mystery names. The names used by the Church were substitutes, they said. So they were, and the "angels" spoke truthfully. Their business with Amadœus was a modest request. They demanded to be legally recognised under their legitimate patronymics, to receive public worship and have a temple of their own. Now the Church in her great wisdom had declined these names from the first, as being those of Chaldean gods, and had substituted for them astrological *aliases.* This then, could not be done, as "they *were names of demons*" explains Baronius. But so were the "substitutes" in Chaldea before they were altered for a purpose in the Hebrew Angelology. And if they are *names of demons,* asks pertinently de Mirville, "why are they yet given to Christians and Roman Catholics at baptism?" The truth is that if the last four enumerated are demon-names, so must be those of Michael, Gabriel and Raphael.

But the "holy" visitors were a match for the Church in obstinacy. At the same hour that Amadœus had his vision at Rome, in Sicily, at Palermo, another wonder was taking place. A miracu-

* He who knows anything of the Purânas and their allegories, knows that the Rishis therein as well as the Manus are Sons of God, of Brahmâ, and themselves gods; that they become men and then, as Saptarishi, they turn into stars and constellations. Finally that they are first 7, then 10, then 14, and finally 21. The occult meaning is evident.

[1] He died at Rome in 1482.

lously-painted picture of the Seven Spirits, was as miraculously exhumed from under the ruins of an old chapel. On the painting *the same seven mystery names* that were being revealed at that hour to Amadœus were also found *inscribed* "under the portrait of each angel,"* says the chronicler.

Whatever might be in this our age of unbelief the feelings of the great and learned leaders of various psychic and telepathic societies on this subject, Pope Sixtus IV. was greatly impressed by the *coincidence*. He believed in Amadœus as implicitly as Mr. Brudenel believed in the Abyssinian prophet, "Herr Paulus."[1] But this was by no means the only "coincidence" of the day. The Holy Roman and Apostolic Church was built on such miracles, and continues to stand on them now as on the rock of Truth; for God has ever sent to her *timely miracles*.[2] Therefore, when also, on that very same day, an old prophecy written in very archaic Latin, and referring to both the find and the revelation was *discovered* at Pisa —it produced quite a commotion among the faithful. The prophecy foretold, you see, *the revival of the* "Planetary-Angel" worship for that period. Also that during the reign of Pope Clement VII., the convent of St. François de Paul would be raised on the emplacement of the little ruined chapel. "The event occurred as predicted," boasts de Mirville, forgetting that the Church had made

---

* *Des Esprits,* &c., par de Mirville.

[1] "Herr Paulus"—the no less miraculous production of Mr. Walter Besant's rather muddled and very one-sided fancy.

[2] *En passant*—a remark may be made and a query propounded:

The "miracles" performed in the bosom of Mother Church—from the apostolic down to the ecclesiastical *miracles* at Lourdes—if not more remarkable than those attributed to "Herr Paulus," are at any rate far more wide-reaching, hence, more pernicious in their result upon the human mind. Either both kinds are possible, or both are due to fraud and *dangerous hypnotic and magnetic powers possessed* by some men. Now Mr. W. Besant evidently tries to impress upon his readers that his novel was written in the interests of that portion of society which is so easily befooled by the other. And if so, why then not have traced all such phenomena *to their original and primeval source, i. e.,* belief *in the possibility of supernatural occurrences because of the inculcated belief in the* MIRACLES *in the Bible, and their continuation by the Church?* No Abyssinian prophet, as no "occult philosopher," has ever made such large claims to "miracle" and *divine help*—and no Peter's pence expected, either—as the "Bride of Christ"—she, of Rome. Why has not then our author, since he was so extremely anxious to save the millions of England from delusion, and so very eager to expose the pernicious means used—why has he not tried to first explode the greater humbug, before he ever touched the *minor* tricks—if any? Let him first explain to the British public the turning of water into wine and the resurrection of Lazarus on the half *hypnotic* and half *jugglery* and *fraud* hypothesis. For, if one set of *wonders* may be explained by blind belief and mesmerism, why not the other? Or is it because the Bible miracles believed in by every Protestant and Catholic (with the *divine* miracles at Lourdes thrown into the bargain by the latter) cannot be as easily handled by an author who desires to remain *popular,* as those of the "occult philosopher" and the spiritual medium? Indeed, no courage, no fearless defiance of the consequences are required to denounce the helpless and now very much scared *professional* medium. But all these qualifications and an ardent *love of truth into the bargain,* are absolutely necessary if one would beard Mrs. Grundy in her den. For this the traducers of the "Esoteric Buddhists" are too prudent and wily. They only seek cheap popularity with the scoffer and the materialist. Well sure they are, that no *professional* medium will ever dare call them wholesale slanderers to their faces, or seek redress from them so long as the law against palmistry is staring him in the face. As to the "Esoteric Buddhist" or "Occult Philosopher," there is still less danger from this quarter. The contempt of the latter for all the would-be traducers is absolute and it requires more than the clumsy denunciations of a novelist to disturb them. And why should they feel annoyed? As they are neither *professional* prophets, nor do they benefit by St. Peter's pence, the most malicious calumny can only make them laugh. Mr. Walter Besant, however, has said a great truth in his novel, a true pearl of foresight, dropped on a heap of mire: the "occult philosopher" does not propose to *"hide his light under a bushel."*

the prediction true herself, by following the command implied in it. Yet this is called a "prophecy" to this day.

But it was only in the XVIth century that the Church consented at last to comply on every point with the request of her "high-born" celestial petitioners.

At that time though there was hardly a church or chapel in Italy without a copy of the *miraculous* picture in painting or mosaic, and that actually, in 1516, a splendid "temple to the seven spirits" had been raised and finished near the ruined chapel at Palermo—still the "angels" failed to be satisfied. In the words of their chronicler—"the blessed spirits were not contented with Sicily alone, and secret prayers. They wanted a world-wide worship and the whole Catholic world to recognise them publicly."

Heavenly denizens themselves, as it seems, are not quite free from the ambition and the vanities of our material plane! This is what the ambitious "Rectors" devised to obtain that which they wanted.

Antonio Duca, another seer (in the annals of the Church of Rome) had been just appointed rector of the Palermo "temple of the seven spirits." About that period, he began to have the same beatific visions as Amadœus had. The Archangels were now urging the Popes through him to recognise them, and to establish a regular and a universal worship in their *own names,* just as it was before Bishop Adalbert's scandal. They insisted upon having a special temple built *for them alone,* and they wanted it upon the ancient site of the famous *Thermæ* of Diocletian. To the erection of these *Thermæ,* agreeably with tradition, 40,000 Christians and 10,000 martyrs had been condemned, and helped in this task by such famous "Saints" as Marcellus and Thraso. Since then, however, as stated in Bull LV. by the Pope Pius IV. "this den had remained set apart for the most profane usages and demon (magic?) rites."

But as it appears from sundry documents, all did not go quite as smooth as the "blessed spirits" would have liked, and the poor Duca had a hard time of it. Notwithstanding the strong protection of the Colonna families who used all their influence with Pope Paul III., and the personal request of Marguerite of Austria, the daughter of Charles Vth., "the seven spirits" could not be satisfied, for the same mysterious (and to us very clear) reasons, though propitiated and otherwise honoured in every way. The difficult mission of Duca, in fact, was crowned with success only thirty-four years later. Ten years before, however, namely in 1551, the preparatory purification of the *Thermæ* had been ordered by Pope Julius III., and a first church had been built under the name of *"St. Mary of the Angels."* But the "Blessed Thrones," feeling displeased with its name, brought on a war during which this temple was plundered and destroyed, as if instead of glorified Archangels they had been maleficent kabalistic *Spooks.*

(To be continued) 555

CYCLIC IMPRESSION AND RETURN AND OUR EVOLUTION*

LECTURE, APRIL 25, 1892, BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, AMERICAN SECTION.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Fellow Theosophists, Ladies and Gentlemen: The title of what I am about to say to you is CYCLIC IMPRESSION AND RETURN AND OUR EVOLUTION. Now what is a cycle? It has nothing to do with the word psychic, and I am sorry to have to say that, because I heard some people this morning repeat the title as "psychic" instead of "cyclic," seeming to think perhaps that that was the same thing, or had some relation to it. The word cyclic is derived from the Greek word *Kuklos,* or a ring. It has been turned in the English language into the word cycle, by the process of saying Kykle, and then cycle. The corresponding word in the Sanscrit is *Kalpa,* which has in fact a wider and a deeper meaning; because cycle in English is a word which covers, is used for, and thus somewhat confuses, many cycles. It is used for the small cycles, and the larger cycles, the intermediate cycles and the great ones, whereas the word *Kalpa* means and implies only one cycle of a large size, and the smaller cycles within that are designated by other words.

What is a cycle? It is a circle, a ring. But not properly a ring like a wedding ring, which runs into itself, but more properly like a screw thread, which takes the form of a spiral, and thus beginning at the bottom, turns on itself, and goes up. It is something like the great Horseshoe Curve in the Pennsylvania Railroad. There you go around the curve at the lower end; you go down into the horseshoe, and as you turn the grade rises, so that when you arrive at the opposite side you have gotten no further than the beginning, but you have risen just the distance between the two ends of the grade.

But what do we mean by a cycle in Theosophy, in our own investigations of nature, or man, or civilization, or our own development, our own origin, our own destiny? We mean by cycles, just what the Egyptians, the Hindoos and the philosophers of the Middle Ages meant by it; that is, that there is a periodical return or cycling back. circling back of something from some place once more. That is why it is called cycle, inasmuch as it returns upon itself, seemingly; but in the Theosophical doctrine, and in the ancient doctrines, it is always a little higher in the sense of perfection or progress. That is to say, as the Egyptians held, cycles prevail everywhere, things come back again, events return, history

---

* This lecture was issued in pamphlet form, and copies of it are rarely to be found. Its great value will be apparent to every student.—[ED. THEOSOPHY]

comes back, and so in this century we have the saying: "History repeats itself."

But where do Theosophists say that cyclic law prevails? We say that it prevails everywhere. It prevails in every kingdom of nature, in the animal kingdom, the mineral world, the human world; in history, in the sky, on the earth. We say that not only do cycles pertain, and appertain, and obtain in and to the earth and its inhabitants, but also in what the Hindoos call the three kingdoms of the universe, the three worlds; that is, that below us, ourselves, and that above.

Now, if you will turn to Buckle, a great writer of the English school, you will find him saying in one of his standard books, a great book often quoted, that there is no doubt cyclic law prevails in regard to nations, that they have come back apparently the same, only slightly improved or degraded, for there is also a downward cycle included within those that rise; but Buckle did not discover a law. He simply once more stated what the ancients had said over and over again. And it has always seemed to me that if Buckle and other people of that kind would pay a little more attention to the ancients, they would save themselves a great deal of trouble, for he obtained his law by much delving, much painstaking labor, whereas he might have gotten the law if he had consulted the ancients, who always taught that there were cycles, and that there always will be cycles.

Among the ancients they had a great many large and important cycles. In their classification they had a Saros and a Naros, which are not understood today by us. They are known to some extent, but what exactly they are, we do not know. The Egyptians taught that there was a great sidereal cycle, and that is recognized today, at last; that is the cycle of 25,000 years, the great one caused by the fact that the sun went through the signs of the Zodiac in that length of time. Now, I do not assume that you know nothing about astronomy, but in order to make it clear, it will be better for me to state this over again, just as it is. The sun goes through the signs of the Zodiac from day to day and from year to year, but at the same time, in going through the signs of the Zodiac, he goes back slowly, like the hands of a clock ticking off the time. In going through that period he comes back to the same point again, and retards himself, or goes back; that is called the precession of the equinoxes, and it is so many seconds in such a length of time. Those seconds in the sky turned into time show you that the sun takes 25,000 and odd years to come back to the place from which he started out at any particular time; that is to say, if you imagine that on the first of April, this year, the sun was in such a degree of Aries, one of the signs of the Zodiac, he will not get back to that sign by the precession of the equinoxes until 25,000 years have passed away.

Now, the sun is the center of our solar system and the earth revolves around it, and as the earth revolves she turns upon her axis. The sun, it is known now by astronomers, as it was known by the ancients (who were ourselves in fact), revolves around a center. That is, that while we are going around the sun, he is going around some other center, so that we describe in the sky not a circle around the sun, but a spiral, as we move with the sun around his enormous orbit. Now do you grasp that idea exactly? It is a very important one, for it opens up the subject to a very large extent. There is a star somewhere in the sky, we do not know where—some think it is Alcyone, or some other star, some think it may be a star in the Pleiades, and some others think it is a star somewhere else—but they know by deduction from the known to the unknown, as Brother Thomas told you this morning, that the sun is attracted himself by some unknown center, and that he turns around it in an enormous circle, and as he turns, of course he draws the earth with him. In the course of 25,000 years in going around the signs of the Zodiac, he must take the earth into spaces where it has never yet been, for when he reaches this point in Aries, after 25,000 years, it is only apparently the same point, just as when I came around the curve of the Horseshoe, I started around the first point and went around the curve, came back to the same point, but I was higher up; I was in another position. And so, when the sun gets back again to the point in Aries, where he was on the first of April this year, he will not be in the exact position in the universe of space, but he will be somewhere else, and in his journey of 25,000 years through billions upon billions of miles, he draws the earth into spaces where she never was before, and never will be as that earth again. He must draw her into cosmic spaces where things are different, and thus cause changes in the earth itself, for changes in cosmic matter in the atmosphere, in the space where the sun draws the earth, must affect the earth and all its inhabitants. The ancients investigated this subject, and declared long ago this 25,000 years cycle, but it is only just lately, so to speak, that we are beginning to say we have discovered this. We know, as Nineteenth century astronomers, that it is a fact, or that it must be a fact, from deduction, but they knew it was a fact because they had observed it themselves and recorded the observations.

The Egyptians had also the cycle of the Moon, which we know, and they had more cycles of the moon than we have, for the moon not only has her cycle of twenty-eight days, when she changes from full to disappearance, and then again to youth, but she also has a period of return somewhere over fourteen years, which must itself have its effect upon the earth.

Then they said, also, that the human soul had its cycles, it being 5,000 years. That is, the man died, or the king died, and his body was turned into a mummy in the hope that when, after his five thousand years cycle had elapsed and he came back once more

to earth, he would find his mummy there? No; but that no one else should have taken his mummied atoms and made a bad use of them. Mummification is explained by us in another way. Their knowledge of the law of cycles caused them to make the first mummy. They held that a human soul returned; they also held that all atoms are alive, just as we do; that they are sensitive points; that they have intelligence belonging to the plane on which they are, and that the man who misuses atoms of matter, such as you have in your bodies and your brains, must stand the consequences. Consequently, saying that to themselves, they said, "If I die, and leave those atoms, which I have used so well, perhaps some other man will take them and use them badly, so I will preserve them as far as possible until I return, and then by a process destroy the combination of atoms, absorb them into some place, or position, where they might be put to good use." That may seem offensive to some today, but I am merely repeating the theory. I am not saying whether I believe it or not.

The ancient Egyptians who held these theories have disappeared and left nothing behind but the pyramids, the temples of Thebes, the Sphinxes and all the great monuments which are slowly being discovered by us. Where have they gone? Have they come back? Do the Copts now in Egypt represent them? I think not, although heredity is the boasted explanation of everything. The Copts are their descendants? They know nothing, absolutely nothing but a simple language, and they live the life of slaves, and yet they are the descendants of the ancient Egyptians! What has become of them? The ancient Egyptians we think were co-laborers with the ancient Hindoos, whose cycle remains; that is to say, whose descendants remain, holding the knowledge, in part, of their fore-fathers, and we find that the Hindoos have held always the same theories as to cycles as the Egyptians held. They divided the ages of the world. They say manifestation begins, and then it lasts for a period called a Kalpa, an enormous number of years; that Kalpa is divided into ages. The small cycle is composed of a large number of years; one will be four thousand, another four hundred thousand, another will be a million, and so on, making a total which we cannot grasp with the mind but which we can write upon the paper.

Now, the idea of cycles came from the Hindoos, through the nations who spread out from there, for it is admitted that the land of Hindustan is the cradle of the race. The Aryan race came down into Christendom, so that we find the Christians, the Romans, the Greeks and all people around that time holding the same theories as to cycles; that is, that cyclic law prevails everywhere. We find it in the ancient mystics, the Christian mystics, the middle age mystics and the mystics of times nearer to ours.

If you will read the works of Higgins, who wrote the Anacalypsis, you will find there laborious compilations and investiga-

tions on the subject of the cycles. Do they obtain? Is there such a thing as a cycle which affects human destiny?

Coming closer to our own personal life, we can see that cycles do and must prevail, for the sun rises in the morning and goes to the center of the sky, descends in the west; the next day he does the same thing, and following him, you rise. You come to the highest point of your activity, and you go to sleep. So day follows night and night follows day. Those are cycles, small cycles, but they go to make the greater ones. You were born, at about seven years of age you began to get discretion to some extent. A little longer and you reach manhood, then you begin to fall, and at last you finish the great day of your life when body dies.

In looking at nature we also find that there are summer and winter, spring and autumn. These are cycles, and every one of them affects the earth, with the human beings upon it.

The esoteric doctrine that Brother Mead has been talking about, the inner doctrine of the old theosophists and the present day theosophists, to be found in every old literature and religious book, is that cyclic law, is the supreme law governing our evolution; that reincarnation, which we talk so much about, is cyclic law in operation and is supreme. For what is reincarnation but a coming back again to life, just what the ancient Egyptians taught and which we are finding out to be probably true, for in no other way than by this cyclic law of reincarnation can we account for the problems of life that beset us; with this we account for our own character, each one different from the other, and with a force peculiar to each person.

This being the supreme law, we have to consider another one, which is related to it and contained in the title I have adopted. That is the law of the return of impressions. What do we mean by that? I mean, those acts and thoughts performed by a nation —not speaking about the things that affect nature, although it is governed by the same law—constitute an impression. That is to say, your coming to this convention creates in your nature an impression. Your going into the street and seeing a street brawl creates an impression. Your having a quarrel last week and denouncing a man, or with a woman and getting very angry, creates an impression in you, and that impression is as much subject to cyclic law as the moon, and the stars, and the world, and is far more important in respect to your development—your personal development or evolution—than all these other great things, for they affect you in the mass, whereas these little ones affect you in detail.

This Theosophical doctrine in respect to cycles, and the evolution of the human race, I think is known to you all, for I am assuming that you are all theosophists.

It is to be described somewhat in this way: Imagine that before this earth came out of the gaseous condition there existed an

earth somewhere in space, let us call it the moon, for that is the exact theory. The moon was once a large and vital body full of beings. It lived its life, went through its cycles, and at last having lived its life, after vast ages had passed away, came to the moment when it had to die; that is, the moment came when the beings on that earth had to leave it, because its period had elapsed, and then began from that earth the exodus. You can imagine it as a flight of birds migrating. Did you ever see birds migrate? I have seen them migrate in a manner that perhaps not many of you have. In Ireland, and perhaps in England, the swallows migrate in a manner very peculiar. When I was a boy, I used to go to my uncle's place where there was an old mass of stone ruins at the end of the garden, and by some peculiar combination of circumstances the swallows of the whole neighboring counties collected there. The way they gathered there was this: When the period arrived, you could see them coming in all parts of the sky, and they would settle down and twitter on this pile of stone all day, and fly about. When the evening came—twilight—they raised in a body and formed an enormous circle. It must have been over forty feet in diameter, and that circle of swallows flew around in the sky, around this tower, around and around for an hour or two, making a loud twittering noise, and that attracted from other places swallows who had probably forgotten the occasion. They kept that up for several days, until one day the period arrived when they must go, and they went away—some were left behind, some came a little early, and some came too late. Other birds migrate in other ways. And so these human birds migrated from the moon to this spot where the earth began (I don't know where it is—a spot in space—) and settled down as living beings, entities, not with bodies, but beings, in that mass of matter, at that point in space, informed it with life, and at last caused this earth to become a ball with beings upon it. And then cycles began to prevail, for the impressions made upon these fathers when they lived in the ancient—mind fails to think how ancient—civilization of the moon, came back again when they got to this earth, and so we find the races of the earth rising up and falling, rising again and falling, rising and falling, and at last coming to what they are now, which is nothing to what they will be, for they go ever higher and higher. That is the theory, broadly, and in that is included the theory of the races, the great seven races who inhabited the earth successively, the great seven Adams who peopled the earth; and at last when this earth shall come to its time of life, its period, all the beings on it will fly away from it to some other spot in space to evolve new worlds as elder brothers who have done the same thing before in other spaces in nature. We are not doing this blindly. It has been done before by others—no one knows when it began. It had nothing in the way of a beginning, it will have no end, but there are always elder brothers of the race, who live on. As some have written, we cannot turn back the cycles in their course. The

fire of patriotism cannot prevail against the higher destiny which will plunge a nation into darkness. All we can do is to change it here and there a little. The elder brothers are subject to law, but they have confidence and hope, because that law merely means that they appear to go down, in order to rise again at a greater height. So that we have come up through the cyclic law from the lowest kingdoms of nature. That is, we are connected in an enormous brotherhood, which includes not only the white people of the earth and the black people of the earth, and the yellow people, but the animal kingdom, the vegetable kingdom, the mineral kingdom and the unseen elemental kingdom. You must not be so selfish as to suppose that it includes only men and women. It includes everything, every atom in this solar system. And we come up from lower forms, and are learning how to so mould and fashion, use and abuse, or impress the matter that comes into our charge, into our bodies, our brains and our psychical nature, so that that matter shall be an improvement to be used by the younger brothers who are still below us, perhaps in the stone beneath our feet. I do not mean by that that there is a human being in that stone. I mean that every atom in the stone is not dead matter. There is no dead matter anywhere, but every atom in that stone contains a life, unintelligent, formless, but potential, and at some period in time far beyond our comprehension, all of those atoms in that stone will have been released. The matter itself will have been refined, and at last all in this great cycle of progress will have been brought up the steps of the ladder, in order to let some others lower still in a state we cannot understand come up to them.

That is the real theory. Is that superstition? If you believe the newspapers that is superstition, for they will twist and turn everything you say. Your enemies will say you said there was a man in that stone, and that you have been a stone. You have not been a stone, but the great monad, the pilgrim who came from other worlds has been in every stone, has been in every kingdom, and now has reached the state of man, to show whether he is able to continue being a man, or whether he will once more fall back, like the boy at school who will not learn, into the lowest class.

(To be continued.)

ON THE LOOKOUT

In the July *Harper's* is an interesting article on "The Master Weavers of the Desert Empire," by M. D. C. Crawford, of the American Museum of Natural History. We have been indebted to *The National Geographical Magazine* for an account of the archaeological investigations conducted within the last few years among the buried tombs and cities of Peru, and now this study of its textile art further corroborates the story of evolution, as set forth in the *Anthropogenesis* of the *Secret Doctrine*. Not that the writer of the article would be flattered to see such a deduction drawn! He is no end cautious lest we suspect him of any such wild theory as Atlantis, but in justice he has to admit to "the fascinating realms of speculation" the opinion of some archaeologists that the great similarity in the textiles of Asia and Peru may be due to a strong cultural relationship between the two countries at some remote period of the world's history. His own great matter for marvel is that the Peruvian textile science is in advance of that of any other people; they carried spinning to the highest perfection the world has ever seen; there is no great class of fabric known today—tapestry, gauze, lawn, laces—but has its prototype with the old Peruvian masters; terms used to describe the Oriental crafts equally apply to Peruvian technique; Asia and Peru used the same designs, the same colorings, the same principles in their looms; all textile art traces back to India, save that of Peru. "Can we," the writer asks, "accept the well-worn theory of intellectual accident for the occurrence?" We certainly can do nothing else, were the land of the Incas the scene of an isolated civilization, its culture indigenous!

The article goes on to say, "Weaving is the most ancient of all the arts. Seek its origin in the history or tradition of any people, and we end in the haze of Myth. Some god or goddess came to each tribe and taught them his intricate craft."

We quote in its entirety from the *Theosophical Glossary*:

> Incas (Peruvian). The name given to the creative gods in the Peruvian theogony, and later to the rulers of the country. "The Incas, seven in number, have repeopled the earth after the Deluge," Coste makes them say (I. IV., p. 19). They belonged at the beginning of the fifth Root-race to a dynasty of divine beings, such as those of Egypt, India and Chaldea.
>
> (Also see Commentary on Stanza XII, Vol. II S. D.)

It seems to be the law of cycles that men of science are blind to. They see in the sorry remains of those great extinct civilizations an infancy rather than a decadence. The mighty arts, now being resurrected from long-buried tombs, went the downward way of the cycle. They were given the seed humanity of the fifth great race in ancient Egypt, India, and pre-Inca Peru by those divine Kings, who were the flower of the preceding great race of mighty Atlantis. So, the occult theory, as usual, reconciles both myth and science. The culture that seems indigenous to such widely separated lands is so indeed, but furthermore, it is the fruit of the *same* root-race and continent that perished back in the mists of the past.

In *The Ocean of Theosophy*, W. Q. J. speaks of "men in whom Higher Manas now and then sheds a bright ray on the man below, to be soon obscured, however, by the effect of dogmatic religious education which has given memory certain pictures that always prevent Manas from gaining full activity." The profound truth of this statement is borne in upon us repeatedly in these days. Theosophy has at this time put its indelible ideas

into minds that in many cases seem to be half unconscious of what it is that so works in them.

In the poets of the day we are bewildered by the warring of ideas that blurs the philosophy we seek, as the divine light is pitifully cramped into the confines of a narrow creed, or again flares forth the Truth.

This condition is to be noted in the poems of Alfred Noyes, that most delightful of poets of today. In his work, be it said, the gleam of truth is the most constant and it is only occasionally marred by a narrow outlook. In fact, the narrowness of his vision is mainly in the fact that he recognises or appears to recognise only one Christ, instead of showing a realization of the fact that has so much historic evidence to bear it out, that He was but one of many, one of a body of advanced Egos who come to us for our enlightenment.

Noyes' poetry abounds in the assurance of infinite possibilities in this infinite universe; he thrills us with his sense of the occult, as he fascinates us with the lilt of his rhythm. And moreover his sense of the occult never degenerates into nonsense.

The *"Tales of The Mermaid Tavern"* enthrall not only by the story quality which strikes so remarkable a balance with the sheer joy of the verse, but with the deep note of philosophy that they sound. A few quotations speak as inferior words concerning them could not.

From the *"Burial of a Queen,"*

"He rebelled;
And so fell short of that celestial height
Whereto the greatest only climb, who stand
By Shakespeare, and accept the eternal Law.
These find in Law, firm footing for the soul,
The strength that binds the stars, and reins the sea,
The base of being, the pillars of the world, the pledge
The pledge of honor, the pure cord of love,
The form of truth, the golden floors of heaven.
These men discern a height beyond all heights,
A depth below all depths, and never an end
Without a pang beyond it, and a hell.
For these despair is like a bubble pricked,
An old romance to make young lovers weep.
For these, the law becomes a fiery road,
A Jacob's ladder through that vast abyss
Lacking no rung from realm to loftier realm,
Nor wanting one degree from dust to wings.
These at last radiant with victory,
Lay their strong hands upon the winged steeds
And fiery chariots, and exult to hold,
Themselves, the throbbing reins, whereby they steer
The stormy splendours.
He, being less, rebelled,
Cried out for unreined steeds, and unruled stars,
An unprohibited ocean and a truth
Untrue; and the equal thunder of the law
Hurled him to night and chaos, who was born
To shine upon the forehead of the day.

"The Origin of Life," written in answer to certain scientific pronouncements, hurls a resounding defiance and withers with satiric logic the tenets of materialism.

The progress of love if it means anything at all must mean reincarnation. *"The Paradox"* is a most Theosophic statement of Deity. These extracts may serve as an introduction, the poem should of course be read entire.

I am the end to which the whole world strives:
Therefore are ye girdled with a wild desire and
With sorrow; for among you all no soul
Shall ever cease or sleep or reach its goal
Of union and communion with the Whole,
Or rest content with less than being God.
Still, as unending asymtotes, your lives
In all their myriad wandering ways
Approach me with the progress of the golden days;
* * * * * *
But one thing is needful; and ye shall be true
To yourselves and the goal and the god that ye seek;
Yea, the day and the night shall requite it to you
If ye love one another, if your love be not weak.

"Of Water and the Spirit," by Margaret Preston Montague, appearing in a recent number of *The Atlantic Monthly,* is a simply told but dynamic story of a great experience coming into an otherwise cramped, narrow, little life, which obliterates all previous ideas like a consuming fire. It is a story of the re-birth of the spirit told in no hackneyed, usual way.

A woman, brought up in a small town in West Virginia toils and saves for twenty years to the end that she may attain a trip to Europe which is desired chiefly because it will give her a prestige which she lacks among the people with whom she has and will probably spend all her days. While she is in Brussels the outbreak of the war occurs. As she and her party are making for Paris in desperate haste by motor, they pass along a meadow strewn with the unfortunates of a recent battle. A wounded man calls out "Water for God's sake," the little backwoods heroine hesitates not, but giving up her one opportunity of leaving this horrible scene allows the motor to proceed, and with the utmost effort of her indomitable will, toils through the terrible day and night to give comfort to her suffering brothers.

And under "the big empty sky" she learned that, "God . . . was inside there with 'em—closer to 'em even than they was to themselves. . . . Folks always talk like He was a father way off in the sky, but I got to know that night that what was really God was something big and close right in your own heart, that was a heap more like a big mother."

When questioned in regard to the literary society that it had been her ambition to join, she said:

"But—but you don't understand, I've been face to face with war and death an' Hell an' God,—I've been born again—do you reckon any of them little old things matter now?"

Will it always be through a terrible experience that we come to a realization of the Real, the Self; does not a tale of this kind help us to throw off the shackles of the little things?

At the last convention of the American Section of the Theosophical Society of which Mrs. Annie Besant is President, a new office was created, called "National President," and the former General Secretary of the Section, Mr. A. P. Warrington, was chosen as the first National President. Apparently the American Section is tending toward a more Theosophical autonomy and is less unwholesomely under Adyar influences. This is manifested more particularly in the better quality of the matter in the Sectional organ, *The Messenger.* The July number contains three meritorious articles. The first is entitled, "The Gods on Earth," and is by Charles Grange Lowther. He writes of the gods of names and forms, "for the perpetuation of which forms men will suffer death and engender worse." But he sees that the great war is "dragging the veil from their little deities," and that "the world

of hard facts and the world of dreams are alike shaken. Men and gods are together in the melting pot. A new thing is imminent—the birth of a greater consciousness."

Charles Hamilton writes of "Concentration." He quotes from Patanjali and makes some excellent applications. He says,

> "The transition from the confused mind to the concentrated mind is not difficult. It is only necessary that we should understand Concentration is only a means to an end. The focused mind is like a searchlight. The operator is the Ego."

The National President writes temperately, sanely, and therefore convincingly on the subject of "Soul Mates." This pernicious and deadly output from "the muddy torrents of *Kama Loka,*" as H. P. B. characterized most of the "revelations" of impure mediums and seers, has not been absent from theosophical experimenters, and Mr. Warrington's article should be of value to many members of the American Section. Madame Blavatsky warned against nothing so much as against empiric and embryonic dabbling in the "occult arts." From the beginning of the Theosophical Society there were unending efforts to make of the Society a "miracle Club," and of its Esoteric Section a Hall of Black Magic through the ill-advised efforts of students to follow what they were pleased to consider as "practical occultism." It is a safe statement to make that the dozen and one cults and followings with which every city is afflicted—all holding out the lure in some form or other of occult preferment, have as their presiding geniuses some renegade student from the E. S. The conflicting teachings among the various Theosophical Societies today are practically all traceable to the personal psychological experiences, real or assumed, of the various professors of occult knowledge and powers. One wonders that *The Messenger* should give space alongside such really excellent articles as those mentioned to a reprint entitled "Angels and Nature Spirits." No possible logical, practical or teaching value can attach to such writings, even if they were correct, which this one manifestly is not. They only serve as a self-advertisement for their authors and to excite in the ill-balanced a thirst for some sort of "experiences." It is a constant reproach to the whole body of students of a noble philosophy that so vast a percentage of theosophical literature—books as well as magazines—for the last twenty years has been devoted to recitals that at best are the product of psychism of a low order, with nothing either educational or inspiring about them, and at worst to delusions of a character not dissimilar to the "Soul-mate" theory about which President Warrington writes. It should be seen that the true criterion for all these theories and pretended revelations of the fruits of later "occult" research, is the concordant, logical and synthetic philosophy of Theosophy—the Theosophy of H. P. B. Only when the student knows the Theosophy she taught is he safe from the charlatan and the dispenser of unverifiable "occult" information, for then he is in a position to discriminate. Were every member of the various Theosophical and "occult" bodies but to read, digest and apply H. P. B.'s two articles, "Lodges of Magic," and "Occultism Versus the Occult Arts," all the pretenders in high places would sink to obscurity and many curious and credulous, but otherwise innocent and well-meaning students be save from penible and useless wanderings and loss.

Recent press dispatches state that Mrs. Annie Besant has been forbidden entrance to the Presidency of Madras by the government of India, as a resultant of her political activity. It is reasonably certain from Mrs. Besant's known characteristics that she will not rest quiet under any prohibitions in opposition to her prevailing mood. Her public career dates from 1874 and since that time she has fought under many banners—social service, atheism, malthusianism, socialism, Theosophy, oriental occultism, Indian politics, whatnot. Her sincerity and courage have been as much in evidence on one battle-

field as another. Throughout her long career one curious dominant note i her nature has been more than once commented on, both by friend and fo That is her inability to take stock of her own mental attitude. She is alway driven by a profound conviction of her own righteousness. Those who op pose her ideas are always *her* opponents. Those who oppose her are alway wrong. It is not her belief in the infallibility of her doctrines that has serve her in lieu of inspiration, but rather her supreme confidence in her ow infallibility. It is the Napoleonic idea transferred to the realm of the inte lectual, the moral and the spiritual. She has never been a learner but a con queror. What she has done for Theosophy might be gauged by a surve of what Theosophy has done for her. It has in no way modified or softene her absorbing passion—to lead, to dominate, in whatever path she enter

In her *Autobiography* she quotes H. P. B. as saying to her in 189 "Child, your pride is terrible." In a letter written in Mrs. Besant's behalf i 1891, H. P. B. speaks strongly of Mrs. Besant's courage and devotion, of he possibilities of usefulness and says "she is all intellect—not spiritual at all. Both H. P. B. and Mr. Judge gave Mrs. Besant every aid and encouragemen toward self-adjustment and self-correction but their efforts were futile be cause then as now Mrs. Besant was too certain of her present virtues to tak an historical view of her own nature. Under her domination the largest o the Theosophical organizations has drifted into numberless side paths an activities that have led her followers far afield in the wilderness of psychism Hindu metaphysics, and useless expenditures of energy in the mummery o organizations, orders, and speculative attempts at the revivification of th *Kama-rupas* of past mistakes in occultism. Her Theosophy has degenerate into a kind of pseudo-brahmanism, from which descent into the effort t raise political issues in the India of today is a natural corollary. Yet she ha before her the example of the path followed by H. P. B. in that same Indi from 1879 to 1885—the path of pure Theosophy. She—and all of us—migh weigh more than we do the words of H. P. B. in her first *Letter* to th American convention of 1888:

> "Theosophists are of necessity the friends of all movements i the world, whether intellectual, or simply practical, for the amelioratio of the condition of mankind. We are the friends of all those wh fight against drunkenness, against cruelty to animals, against injustic to women, against corruption in society or in government, althoug we do not meddle in politics. We are the friends of those who exercis practical charity, who seek to lift a little of the tremendous weight o misery that is crushing down the poor. But, in our quality of The osophists, we cannot engage in any one of these great works in par ticular. As individuals we may do so, but as Theosophists we have larger, more important, and much more difficult work to do."

And in her last *Letter,* that to the American Convention of 1891, H P. B. once more emphasized what that work for Theosophists is. She wrote

> "After all, every wish and thought I can utter are summed up i this one sentence, the never-dormant wish of my heart, 'Be Theoso phists, work for Theosophy!' Theosophy first, and Theosophy last for its *practical* realization alone can save the western world from tha selfish and unbrotherly feeling that now divides race from race, on nation from the other."

The real well-wishers of Mrs. Besant—and we are among them—ca but regret that her great energies and strong nature should be misspen India needs a spiritual, not a political, awakening. Her true emancipatio lies, not in independence of foreign rule, but in casting off the shackles o spiritual selfishness, and of its age-old progeny of caste, sect and racial sep arateness. The spread of Theosophical principles and their practical appli cation alone can revive India. In attempting to "do the duty of another Mrs. Besant is wasting a priceless opportunity.